DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 812 CE 012 081

TITLE Minor and Technical Amendments to the Vocational Education Act; Hearing before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor House of Representatives, Ninety-Fifth Congress, First Session on H.R. 3427 (February 17, 1977, Washington, D.C.).

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.

PUB DATE 17 Feb 77

NOTE 89p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of the original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS Community Agencies (Public); *Educational Finance; *Educational Legislation; Educational Needs; Federal Legislation; *Program Administration; Speeches; State Agencies; *Vocational Education

IDENTIFIERS American Vocational Association; Vocational Education Amendments 1976

ABSTRACT

The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor met to hear the need for miscellaneous and technical amendments to the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1976. The discussion focused on the question of how much in Federal funds ought to be used for support of State and local vocational education program administration. The new vocational amendments would limit the State administration to $25 million a year and would bar the use of Federal funds for local administration. Representing The American Vocational Association, Lowell A. Burkett delivered the primary testimony which called for more funds to be used for support of State and local administration of vocational education programs. Numerous letters, prepared statements, and supplementary materials (all of which are included in this document) were also presented as they related to the proposed amendments. (BM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED142812

MINOR AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-FIFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 3437

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.
FEBRUARY 17, 1977

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor
CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*

JUN 27 1977

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 012 081

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
85-808O WASHINGTON : 1977

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
MICHAEL T. BLOUIN, Iowa
ROBERT J. CORNELL, Wisconsin
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
EDWARD P. BEARD, Rhode Island
LEO C. ZEFERETTI, New York
GEORGE MILLER, California
RONALD M. MOTTL, Ohio
MICHAEL O. MYERS, Pennsylvania
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
JOSEPH A. LeFANTE, New Jersey
TED WEISS, New York
CEC HEFTEL, Hawaii
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan

ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut
JOHN BUCHANAN, Alabama
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
BUD SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
SHIRLEY N. PETTIS, California
CARL D. PURSELL, Michigan
MICKEY EDWARDS, Oklahoma

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
MICHAEL T. BLOUIN, Iowa
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
LEO C. ZEFERETTI, New York
RONALD M. MOTTL, Ohio
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
JOSEPH A. LeFANTE, New Jersey
TED WEISS, New York
CEC HEFTEL, Hawaii
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
GEORGE MILLER, California

ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN BUCHANAN, Alabama
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
SHIRLEY N. PETTIS, California
CARL D. PURSELL, Michigan

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington D.C., February 17, 1977	1
Text of H.R. 3437	1
Statement of:	
Burkett, Lowell A., executive director, American Vocational Association, accompanied by Daniel Dunham, State director, Division of Vocational-Technical Education, Maryland State Department of Education and George Quarles, chief administrator, Office of Career Education, Board of Education, New York	28
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, et cetera:	
Bowen, Hon. David R., a Representative in Congress from the State of Mississippi, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 17, 1977, with enclosures	75
Briggs, Paul W., superintendent, Cleveland Public Schools, Cleveland, Ohio, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 16, 1977	63
Burke, Fred G., commissioner, State of New Jersey, Department of Education, Trenton, N.J. letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 22, 1977	62
Burkett, Lowell A., executive director, American Vocational Association:	
Letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 14, 1977	23
Prepared statement of	11
Carney, Hon. Charles J., a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 2, 1977, with enclosure	56
Cederberg, Hon. Elford "Al", a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 10 1977, with enclosure	74
Cohen, Hon. William S. a Representative in Congress from the State of Maine, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 10, 1977, with enclosure	68
Cornell, Hon. Robert J., a Representative in Congress from the State of Wisconsin, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 22, 1977, with enclosure	72
Custer, Herbert F., Jr., vocational coordinator Martha's Vineyard Regional High School District, Oak Bluffs, Mass., letter to Hon. Gerry Studds, dated January 25, 1977	82
Duncan, Verne A., superintendent of public instruction, Salem, Oreg., letter to Hon. Al Ullman, dated February 10, 1977	70
Dunham, Daniel B., assistant state superintendent, Vocational-Technical Education, Maryland State Department of Education, Baltimore, Md., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 23, 1977, with enclosure	44
Ford, Hon. William D., a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 11, 1977, with enclosures	69
Green, Charles H., chief division of Post-Secondary Education, State of New Hampshire, Department of Education, Concord, N.H., letter to John F. Jennings, dated January 31, 1977	65
Hargraves, George, superintendent, Jefferson County Joint Vocational High School, Bloomingdale, Ohio, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 1, 1977	63
Harsha, Hon. William H., a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 2, 1977	72
Hunter, Thomas L., associate, guidance services, Cincinnati Public Schools, Education Center, Cincinnati, Ohio, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 17, 1977	57
Latta, Hon. Delbert L., a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 28, 1977, with enclosures	51

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material—Continued

	Page
Lucas, William L., chairman, Federal legislation and finance committee, ACSA Committee, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 4, 1977, with enclosure	83
Lucas, William L., Los Angeles City Board of Education, Los Angeles, Calif., letter to Hon. Albert H. Quie, dated February 15, 1977	61
National Education Association, etc., prepared statement of	46
Percentage of Federal funds the States use for State and local administration in vocational education (tables)	5
Quarles, George R., chief administrator, Center for Career and Occupational Education, Board of Education of the city of New York, prepared statement of	25
Reynolds, Donald F., director, Career Education Services Unit, Los Angeles Unified School District, Los Angeles, Calif., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 2, 1977	84
Robinson, James L., director, Office of Government Liaison, U.S. Catholic Conference, Washington, D.C., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 15, 1977	67
Shepherd, Susan J., director, Vocational Education and Career Development, Charlevoix-Emmet Intermediate School District, Charlevoix, Mich., letter to Hon. Philip E. Ruppe, dated February 4, 1977	75
Snyder, Wilbur M., administrator for vocational education, director of Clover Park Voc-Tech. Institute, Education Center, Lakewood Center, Wash., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 18, 1977	65
Stanton, Hon. William, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 25, 1977, with enclosure	61
Steed, Hon. Tom, a Representative in Congress from the State of Oklahoma, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated January 24, 1977, with enclosure	67
Steiger, Hon. William A., a Representative in Congress from the State of Wisconsin, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 16, 1977, with enclosure	55
Strout, Dr. George, acting director, New Hampshire Vocational-Technical College, Portsmouth, N.H., letter to John F. Jennings, dated February 7, 1977	66
Vanik, Hon. Charles A., a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 24, 1977, with enclosures	58
Whalen, Hon. Charles E., Jr., a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 22, 1977, with enclosures	47
Wigtil, James V., Columbus, Ohio, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 15, 1977	71

MINOR AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1977

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY,
SECONDARY AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9 a.m. in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Perkins, Murphy, LeFante, Kildee, Miller, and Goodling.

Staff present: John F. Jennings, majority counsel; and Charles Radcliffe, minority counsel.

[Text of H.R. 3437 follows:]

[H.R. 3437, 95th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To make certain technical and miscellaneous amendments to provisions relating to vocational education contained in the Education Amendments of 1976

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 102(a) (as in effect on October 1, 1977) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended by striking out "$1,325,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,325,000,000", and by striking out $1,485,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,485,000,000".

(2) Section 102(d)(4) (as in effect on October 1, 1977) of such Act is amended by inserting "and" after paragraph (2) and by striking out "; and, (4) State administration of vocational education programs assisted under this Act".

(3) Section 103(a)(1)(A) (as in effect on October 12, 1976, pursuant to section 204(a)(2)(B) of the Education Amendments of 1976) of such Act is amended by inserting "(b)(1)" immediately after "161".

(4) Section 103(a)(1)(B)(iii) (as in effect on October 1, 1977) of such Act is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof: "The Bureau of Indian Affairs shall expend an amount equal to the amount made available under this subparagraph to pay a part of the costs of programs funded under this subparagraph. The Commissioner and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs shall jointly prepare a plan for the expenditure of funds made available and for the evaluation of programs assisted under this subparagraph".

(5) Section 105(a)(20) (as in effect on October 1, 1977) of such Act is amended by striking out "clauses of this paragraph" and inserting in lieu thereof "clauses of this sentence".

(6)(A) The first sentence of section 105(f)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "$8,000,000 for fiscal year 1982" and by inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1982".

(B) The second sentence of section 105(f)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately after "State advisory councils" the following: "from amounts allotted to such advisory councils in accordance with the method for allotment contained in section 103(a)(2),".

(7) Section 106(a)(8) of such Act is amended by inserting ")" after "under subpart 5 of this part".

(8) Section 107(a)(1) (as in effect on October 12, 1976, pursuant to section 204(a)(2)(A) of the Education Amendments of 1976) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof "in which the plan is submitted", and in the fifth sentence thereof by striking out "(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(A)", by striking out "(b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(B)", and by striking out "(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(C)".

(9) Sections 110(a) and 110(b)(1) of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 110. (a) For each fiscal year, at least 10 per centum of each States allotment under section 103 from appropriations made under section 102(a) shall be used to pay up to 50 per centum of the cost of programs, services, and activities under subpart 2 and of program improvement and supportive services under subpart 3 for handicapped persons.

"(b)(1) For each fiscal year, at least 20 per centum of each State's allotment under section 103 from appropriations made under section 102(a) shall be used to pay up to 50 per centum of the cost of programs, services, and activities under subpart 2 and of program improvement and supportive services under subpart 3 for disadvantaged persons (other than handicapped persons), for persons who have limited English-speaking ability, and for providing stipends authorized under section 120(b)(1)(G).".

(11) Section 110(c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) For each fiscal year, at least 15 per centum of each State's allotment under section 103 from appropriations made under section 102(a) shall be used to pay up to 50 per centum of the cost of programs, services, and activities under subpart 2 and of program improvement and supportive services under subpart 3 for (1) persons who have completed or left high school and who are enrolled in organized programs of study for which credit is given toward an associate or other degree, but which programs are not designed as baccalaureate or higher degree programs, and (2) persons who have already entered the labor market, or are unemployed, or who have completed or left high school and who are not described in paragraph (1).".

(12) Section 111(a)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "equal to" and by inserting in lieu thereof "not to exceed".

(13) Section 111(a)(1)(B) (as in effect on October 1, 1977) of such Act is amended by striking out "section" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections" and by striking out "vocational education programs" and by inserting in lieu thereof "programs, services, and activities under subpart 2 and program improvement and supportive devices under subpart 3".

(14) Section 111(a)(1)(C) (as in effect on October 1, 1977) of such Act is amended by striking out "133(b) and 140" and inserting in lieu thereof "132(b), and 140(b)(2)".

(15) Section 111(a)(2)(A) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2)(A) In addition, the Commissioner shall pay, from each State's allotment under section 103 from appropriations made under section 102(a), an amount not to exceed the Federal share of the cost of State administration of such plans.".

(16)(A) Section 120(b)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "and" at the end of clause (L), by striking out the period at the end of clause (M) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new clauses:

"(N) provision of vocational training through arrangements with private vocational training institutions where such private institutions can make a significant contribution to attaining the objectives of the State plan, and can provide substantially equivalent training at a lesser cost, or can provide equipment or services not available in public institutions; and

"(O) subject to the provisions of section 111, State administration of the five-year plan submitted pursuant to section 107 and of the annual program plan submitted pursuant to section 108, except that not more than 80 per centum of the amount of payments determined under section 111 for such purposes shall be made from grants under this subpart."

(B) Section 130(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "and" after paragraph (5), by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by inserting immediately by below paragraprh (6) of such section the following new paragraph:

"(7) Subject to the provisions of section 111, State administration of the five-year plan submitted pursuant to section 107 and of the annual program plan submitted pursuant to section 108, except that not more than 20 per centum of the amount of payments determined under section 111 for such purposes shall be made from grants under this subpart.".

(17) That portion of section 132(a) of such Act preceding paragraph (1) is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 132. (a) Funds available to the States under section 130(a) may be used for contracts by State research coordination units pursuant to comprehensive plans of program improvement for the support of exemplary and innovative programs, including—".

(18) That portion of section 133(a) of such Act preceding paragraph (1) is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 133. (a) Funds available to the States under section 130(a) may be used for contracts by State research coordination units pursuant to comprehensive plans of program improvement for the support of curriculum development projects, including—".

(19) Section 134(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "shall include" and by inserting in lieu thereof "shall include one or more of the following activities".

(20) Section 150(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "provision of equipment, and State administration and leadership" and by inserting in lieu thereof "and provision of equipment".

(21) Section 161(a)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 112" and by inserting in lieu thereof "section 112(b)".

(22) Section 161(a)(3)(A) of such Act is amended by striking out "October 1, 1977" and by inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1978".

(23) Section 161(b)(1) (as in effect on October 12, 1976, pursuant to section 204(a)(2)(B) of the Education Amendments of 1976) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately after "in effect" in the second sentence the following: "on the date of the enactment of the Education Amendments of 1976 and", and in clause (B) by striking out "September 30, 1977" and by inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1978".

(24) Section 162(c) (as in effect on October 1, 1977) of such Act is amended by striking out "paragraph" in the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection", and by adding at the end of such section the following new sentence: "The National Council may accept gifts if the acceptance of such gifts will better enable it to carry out its functions under this section.".

(25) Sections 191 and 192 (as in effect on October 1, 1977) of such Act are each amended by striking out "part" and inserting in lieu thereof "subpart", and such section 191 is further amended by striking out "August 2" and inserting in lieu thereof "August 12".

(26) Section 195(7) of such Act is amended by striking out "crippled and inserting in lieu thereof "orthopedically impaired" and by inserting immediately after "impaired children" the following: ", or children with specific learning disabilities,".

(27) Section 195(15) of such Act is amended by striking out "designating" and inserting in lieu thereof "designing".

(28) Section 203 of the Education Amendments of 1976 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c)(1) Section 104 of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 is amended by adding before the period at the end thereof the following: '(as such Act will be in effect on October 1, 1977)'.

"(2) The amendment made by this section shall be effective on and after October 1, 1977.".

(29) Section 523(b)(2) of the Education Amendments of 1976 is amended by striking out "September 30, 1979" and by inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1980" and by striking out "September 30, 1980" and by inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1981". Such section 523(b)(2) is further amended by striking out everything which appears after "under this section".

(30)(A) Section 523(b)(3) of the Education Amendments of 1976 is amended by striking "section" at the end of the first sentence and by inserting in lieu thereof "subsection concerning the National Institute of Education", and the

second sentence of such section is amended by striking "October 1, 1979" and by inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1981".

(B) The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on and after October 1, 1977.

Chairman PERKINS. The subcommittee will come to order.

The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education is holding a hearing today on the need for miscellaneous and technical amendments to the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1976. Specifically, we will concentrate on the question of how much in Federal funds ought to be used for support of State and local vocational education program administration.

The new vocational amendments, which will go into effect October 1, 1977, limit State administration to $25 million a year and bar the use of Federal funds for local administration. Since these amendments were passed last year, State and local people have indicated to us that more Federal funds than this will be necessary for these purposes.

We have representatives of the American Vocational Association here today who will testify to this need.

I introduced a technical amendments bill, H.R. 3437, on February 9 with the cosponsorship of Mr. Quie. This bill would place State administration in the block grant for vocational education and therefore would permit more than $25 million to be used for that purpose. This bill does not deal with the question of local administration.

On the question of local administration, Congressman Quie and I feel it is necessary to hear the testimony today before we endorse any particular course of action. The reason for our reluctance is that the data from a survey conducted by the American Vocational Association indicates that the use of Federal funds for local administration varies greatly from State to State. Eleven States use no Federal money at all for local administration, while 10 States take 25 percent or more of their local administrative funds from Federal funds.

The survey also shows, however, that the States use seven times as much State and local money for local administration as they do Federal money. Thirty-one States use a greater percentage of their total State and local vocational expenditures for local administration than of their total Federal vocational expenditures.

I would like to insert into the record at this point a set of tables drawn up by the Subcommittee staff on the percentage of Federal funds the States use for State and local administration in vocational education. The tables are based on data submitted to the Subcommittee by the American Vocational Association prior to this hearing, but have been modified to reflect updated figures submitted by two States.

TABLE 1.--EXPENDITURES FOR STATE ADMINISTRATION IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, FISCAL YEAR 1976

State	Expenditures for State administration from State local funds	Percent of total State local vocational education expenditures	Expenditures for State administration from Federal funds	Percent of total Federal vocational education expenditures	Total expenditures for State administration	Percent of total vocational education expenditures
Alabama	$1,063,357	2.8	$1,399,501	12.3	$2,462,858	5.0
Alaska	128,110	2.3	253,559	18.5	381,669	5.5
Arizona	263,652	1.2	858,757	14.1	1,122,409	3.9
Arkansas	275,412	1.1	763,017	11.6	1,038,429	3.3
California	0	0	6,370,080	8.1	6,370,080	1.4
Colorado	148,907	.4	1,201,710	16.7	1,350,617	3.0
Connecticut	2,089,668	5.3	655,931	9.8	2,745,599	6.0
Delaware	210,981	2.1	268,848	17.0	479,829	4.2
Florida	306,212	.1	4,389,491	22.0	4,695,703	2.0
Georgia	944,960	1.8	919,620	6.6	1,864,580	2.8
Hawaii	163,309	1.9	141,874	5.3	305,183	2.7
Idaho	614,698	.4	0	0	614,698	.4
Illinois	974,197	3.9	1,305,243	10.1	2,279,440	6.0
Indiana	445,608	2.5	848,856	6.6	1,294,464	3.4
Iowa	636,885	1.4	636,886	8.1	1,273,771	2.3
Kansas	262,296	1.3	306,505	4.9	568,801	2.2
Kentucky	3,335,515	9.8	671,412	6.8	4,006,927	8.1
Louisiana	440,000	1.1	229,000	1.8	669,000	1.3
Maine	241,333	2.5	289,885	9.1	531,218	4.1
Maryland	535,388	.8	576,762	14.8	1,112,150	1.5
Massachusetts	234,537	.1	1,602,507	12.3	1,837,044	1.0
Michigan	667,703	.6	1,736,054	10.0	2,403,757	1.8
Minnesota	167,061	.2	785,950	9.4	953,011	1.0
Mississippi	1,116,563	3.5	364,355	5.9	1,480,918	3.9
Missouri	22,651	.04	1,183,279	10.6	1,205,930	1.9
Montana	150,000	1.9	289,380	11.6	439,380	4.3
Nebraska	224,859	1.6	291,227	6.6	516,086	2.8
Nevada	195,000	5.7	195,000	20.8	390,000	8.9
New Hampshire	152,015	1.8	543,576	21.3	695,591	6.4
New Jersey	869,104	1.4	1,667,702	10.6	2,536,806	3.3
New Mexico	284,750	2.4	321,697	11.0	606,447	4.1
New York	946,729	.2	3,084,861	10.6	4,031,590	.8
North Carolina	4,031,893	2.8	425,609	2.7	4,457,502	2.8
North Dakota	256,663	3.6	303,463	12.9	560,126	5.9
Ohio	92,801	.07	2,091,598	10.1	2,184,399	1.4
Oklahoma	1,085,072	2.9	1,294,476	14.7	2,379,548	5.1
Oregon	250,771	1.1	783,086	9.6	1,033,857	3.4
Pennsylvania	461,194	.2	2,005,122	6.3	2,466,316	1.1
Rhode Island	20,000	.1	318,000	9.4	338,000	1.6
South Carolina	687,699	.9	782,127	9.6	1,469,826	1.7
South Dakota	123,975	.2	161,678	5.5	285,653	3.1
Tennessee	1,926,493	1.7	414,481	2.8	2,340,974	1.8
Texas	0	0	3,616,372	27.0	3,616,372	2.1
Utah	339,341	1.7	242,051	4.5	581,392	2.3
Vermont	177,743	2.5	103,303	6.6	281,046	3.2
Virginia	1,290,238	1.6	73,813	.5	1,364,051	1.5
Washington	647,413	.7	1,583,868	19.6	2,231,281	2.1
West Virginia	285,391	1.3	604,503	10.0	809,894	2.9
Wisconsin	698,304	.8	1,991,157	19.5	2,689,461	2.7
Wyoming	123,239	2.4	189,389	14.5	312,628	4.9
Total	30,609,690	.8	51,136,621	9.5	81,746,311	2.0

83-508 O - 77 - 2

TABLE II.—EXPENDITURES FOR STATE ADMINISTRATION IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 1976

State	Expenditures for State administration from Federal funds	Total expenditures for State administration	Percent of State administration expenditures that is Federal
Alabama	$1,339,501	$2,462,558	56.8
Alaska	253,559	381,669	66.4
Arizona	858,757	1,122,409	76.5
Arkansas	763,017	1,038,429	73.5
California	6,370,080	6,170,080	100.0
Colorado	1,201,710	1,350,617	89.0
Connecticut	655,931	2,745,599	23.9
Delaware	268,948	479,829	56.0
Florida	4,389,491	4,695,703	93.5
Georiga	919,620	1,864,580	49.3
Hawaii	141,874	305,183	46.5
Idaho	0	614,698	0
Illinois	1,305,243	2,279,440	57.2
Indiana	848,856	1,294,464	65.6
Iowa	636,886	1,273,771	50.0
Kansas	306,505	568,801	53.9
Kentucky	671,412	4,006,927	16.8
Louisiana	229,000	669,000	34.2
Maine	289,885	531,218	54.6
Maryland	576,762	1,112,150	51.4
Massachusetts	1,602,507	1,837,044	87.2
Michigan	1,736,054	2,403,757	72.2
Minnesota	785,950	953,011	82.5
Mississippi	364,355	1,480,918	24.6
Missouri	1,183,279	1,205,930	98.1
Montana	289,380	439,380	65.9
Nebraska	291,727	516,086	56.4
Nevada	195,000	390,000	50.0
New Hampshire	543,576	695,591	78.1
New Jersey	1,667,702	2,536,806	65.7
New Mexico	321,697	606,447	53.0
New York	3,084,861	4,031,590	76.5
North Carolina	425,609	4,457,502	9.5
North Dakota	303,463	560,126	54.2
Ohio	2,091,598	2,184,399	95.8
Oklahoma	1,294,476	2,379,548	54.4
Oregon	783,086	1,033,857	75.7
Pennsylvania	2,005,122	2,466,316	81.3
Rhode Island	318,000	338,000	94.0
South Carolina	782,127	1,469,826	53.2
South Dakota	161,678	285,653	56.6
Tennessee	414,481	2,340,974	17.7
Texas	3,616,372	3,616,372	100.0
Utah	242,051	581,392	41.6
Vermont	103,303	281,046	36.8
Virginia	73,813	1,364,051	5.4
Washington	1,583,868	2,231,281	71.0
West Virginia	604,503	809,894	74.6
Wisconsin	1,991,157	2,689,461	74.0
Wyoming	189,389	312,628	60.6
Total	51,136,621	81,746,311	62.6

TABLE III.—EXPENDITURES FOR LOCAL ADMINISTRATION IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—FISCAL YEAR 1976

State	Expenditures for local administration from State/local money	Percent of total State/local vocational expenditures	Expenditures for local administration from Federal money	Percent of total Federal vocational expenditures	Total expenditures for local administration	Percent of total vocational education expenditures
Alabama	$1,486,437	4.0	$155,448	1.4	$1,641,885	3.4
Alaska	209,000	3.7	0	0	209,000	3.0
Arizona	249,570	1.1	546,185	9.0	795,755	2.7
Arkansas	2,369,897	9.6	723,276	11.0	3,093,173	9.9
California	13,285,532	3.6	1,476,170	1.9	14,761,702	3.3
Colorado	2,331,299	6.0	0	0	2,331,299	5.0
Connecticut	1,600,000	4.1	240,000	3.6	1,840,000	4.0
Delaware	285,000	3.0	0	0	285,000	2.5
Florida	1,845,000	.8	0	0	1,845,000	.8
Georgia	4,396,511	8.1	624,283	4.5	5,020,794	7.4
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	593,245	6.8	96,755	3.6	690,000	6.0
Illinois	1,000,000	.6	1,000,000	5.5	2,000,000	1.1
Indiana	1,188,985	4.7	714,480	5.5	1,903,465	5.0
Iowa	4,828,234	10.3	761,294	9.7	5,589,528	10.2
Kansas	645,764	3.2	248,371	4.0	894,135	3.4
Kentucky	2,005,460	5.9	0	0	2,005,460	4.6
Louisiana	421,645	1.1	448,479	3.4	870,124	1.6
Maine	726,792	7.4	55,000	1.7	781,792	6.0
Maryland	3,081,837	4.3	123,069	3.2	3,204,906	4.3
Massachusetts	5,538,188	3.2	0	0	5,538,188	3.0
Michigan	9,433,412	8.3	357,189	2.1	9,790,601	7.5
Minnesota	8,350,000	9.7	750,000	9.0	9,100,000	9.6
Mississippi	1,751,991	5.4	177,145	2.9	1,929,136	5.0
Missouri	2,786,595	5.2	34,640	.3	2,821,235	4.3
Montana	283,421	3.6	33,188	1.3	316,609	3.1
Nebraska	458,840	3.2	135,571	3.1	594,441	3.2
Nevada	585,277	17.1	125,000	13.3	710,277	16.3
New Hampshire	300,000	3.6	100,000	3.9	400,000	3.7
New Jersey	7,461,502	12.4	0	0	7,461,502	9.9
New Mexico	277,216	2.3	0	0	277,216	1.9
New York	824,197	.2	575,000	2.0	1,399,197	.3
North Carolina	1,197,619	.8	194,514	.2	1,392,133	.9
North Dakota	385,975	5.4	0	0	385,975	4.1
Ohio	10,779,182	7.8	3,741,244	18.0	14,520,426	9.1
Oklahoma	2,488,658	.6	197,204	2.2	2,685,862	5.8
Oregon	2,550,000	11.4	460,000	5.6	3,010,000	10.0
Pennsylvania	6,520,320	3.5	525,040	1.6	7,045,360	3.2

TABLE III.—EXPENDITURES FOR LOCAL ADMINISTRATION IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—FISCAL YEAR 1976—Continued

State	Expenditures for local administration from State/local money	Percent of total State-local vocational expenditures	Expenditures for local administration from Federal money	Percent of total Federal vocational expenditures	Total expenditures for local administration	Percent of total vocational education expenditures
Rhode Island	710,000	4.0	540,000	16.0	1,250,000	5.9
South Carolina	1,370,318	1.8	159,377	2.0	1,529,695	1.8
South Dakota	362,420	5.8	171,732	5.8	534,152	5.8
Tennessee	6,210,053	5.3	835,192	5.6	7,045,245	5.4
Texas	3,000,000	1.9	210,000	1.6	3,210,000	1.9
Utah	1,051,264	5.1	185,517	3.5	1,236,782	4.9
Vermont	307,112	4.3	0	0	307,112	3.5
Virginia	3,585,772	4.6	0	0	3,585,772	3.9
Washington	18,492,423	19.0	1,495,184	18.5	19,987,607	19.0
West Virginia	1,986,291	7.1	2,752	.04	1,989,043	9.1
Wisconsin	26,705,053	29.4	1,987,329	19.2	28,692,382	28.5
Wyoming	4,688,865	91.9	812,399	62.2	5,501,264	85.8
Total	172,991,172	4.9	21,018,054	3.9	194,010,199	4.9

TABLE IV.—USE OF FEDERAL VOCATIONAL FUNDS FOR LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

State	Expenditures for local administration from Federal funds	Total expenditures for local administration	Percent of local administration expenditure that is Federal
Alabama	155,443	1,641,885	9.4
Alaska	0	209,000	0
Arizona	546,185	795,755	68.6
Arkansas	723,276	3,093,173	23.4
California	1,476,170	14,761,702	10.0
Colorado	0	2,331,299	0
Connecticut	240,000	1,840,000	13.0
Delaware	0	285,000	0
Florida	0	1,845,000	0
Georgia	624,283	5,020,794	12.4
Hawaii	0	0	0
Idaho	96,755	680,000	14.2
Illinois	1,000,000	2,000,000	50.0
Indiana	714,480	1,903,465	37.5
Iowa	761,294	5,589,528	13.6
Kansas	248,371	894,135	27.8
Kentucky	0	2,005,460	0
Louisiana	448,479	870,124	51.5
Maine	55,000	781,792	7.0
Maryland	123,000	3,294,906	3.8
Massachusetts	0	5,538,188	0
Michigan	357,189	9,790,601	3.6
Minnesota	750,000	9,100,000	8.2
Mississippi	177,145	1,929,136	9.2
Missouri	34,640	2,821,235	1.2
Montana	33,188	316,605	10.5
Nebraska	135,571	594,441	22.8
Nevada	125,000	710,277	17.6
New Hampshire	100,000	400,000	25.0
New Jersey	0	7,461,502	0
New Mexico	0	277,216	0
New York	575,000	1,399,197	41.1
North Carolina	194,514	1,392,133	14.0
North Dakota	0	385,975	0
Ohio	3,741,244	14,520,426	25.8
Oklahoma	197,204	2,685,862	7.3
Oregon	460,000	3,010,000	15.3
Pennsylvania	525,040	7,045,360	7.5
Rhode Island	540,000	1,250,000	43.2
South Carolina	159,377	1,529,695	10.4
South Dakota	171,732	534,152	32.2
Tennessee	835,192	7,045,245	11.9
Texas	210,000	3,210,000	6.5
Utah	185,517	1,236,781	15.0
Vermont	0	307,112	0
Virginia	0	3,585,772	0
Washington	1,495,184	19,987,607	7.5
West Virginia	2,752	1,989,043	.1
Wisconsin	1,987,329	28,692,382	6.9
Wyoming	812,399	5,501,264	14.8
Total	21,018,054	194,010,199	10.8

TABLE V.—SURVEY OF STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION EXPENDITURES FOR STATE AND LOCAL ADMINISTRATION—FISCAL YEAR 1976

STATE	Local administration				State administration				
	Staff FTE	State/local expenditures	Federal expenditures	Total expenditures	Staff FTE	State expenditures	Federal expenditures	Total expenditures	Additional expenditures required to implement planning provision of 94-482
Alabama	104	$1,486,437	$155,488	$1,641,885	115	$1,063,357	$1,399,501	$2,462,858	$658,817
Alaska	7	209,000	0	209,000	11	128,110	253,559	381,669	20,000
Arizona	36	249,570	546,185	795,755	51	263,652	858,757	1,122,409	250,000
Arkansas	71	2,369,897	723,276	3,093,173	55	275,412	763,017	1,038,429	485,000
California	1,263	13,285,532	1,476,170	14,761,702	147	0	6,370,080	6,370,080	300,000
Colorado	131	2,331,299	0	2,331,299	57	148,907	1,201,710	1,350,617	281,327
Connecticut	50	1,600,000	240,000	1,840,000	110	2,089,668	655,931	2,745,599	200,000
Delaware	11	285,000	0	285,000	21	210,981	268,848	479,829	16,000
Florida	123	1,845,000	0	1,845,000	155	306,212	4,389,491	4,695,703	148,500
Georgia	510	4,396,511	624,283	5,020,794	99	944,960	919,620	1,864,580	170,000
Hawaii		0	0	0	16	163,309	141,874	305,183	40,000
Idaho	44	593,245	96,755	690,000	44	614,698	0	614,698	100,000
Illinois	400	1,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	84	974,197	1,305,243	2,279,440	500,000
Indiana	100	1,188,985	714,480	1,903,465	61	445,608	848,856	1,294,464	500,000
Iowa	475	4,838,234	761,294	5,589,528	67	636,885	636,886	1,273,771	127,300
Kansas	75	645,764	248,371	894,135	26	262,296	306,505	568,801	75,000
Kentucky	81	2,005,460	0	2,005,460	259	3,335,515	671,412	4,006,927	225,000
Louisiana	56	421,645	448,479	870,124	56	440,000	229,000	669,000	250,000
Maine	49	726,792	55,000	781,792	34	241,333	289,885	531,218	200,000
Maryland	128	3,081,837	123,069	3,204,906	50	535,388	576,762	1,112,150	210,000

Massachusetts	611	5, 538, 188	0	5, 538, 188	120	234, 537	1, 602, 507	1, 837, 044	127, 900
Michigan	196	9, 433, 412	357, 189	9, 790, 601	95	667, 703	1, 736, 054	2, 403, 757	250, 000
Minnesota	263	8, 350, 000	750, 000	9, 100, 000	66	167, 061	785, 950	953, 011	250, 000
Mississippi	109	1, 751, 991	177, 145	1, 929, 136	84	1, 116, 563	364, 355	1, 480, 918	100, 000
Missouri	175	2, 786, 595	34, 640	2, 821, 235	62	22, 651	1, 183, 279	1, 205, 930	100, 000
Montana	25	283, 421	33, 188	316, 609	19	150, 000	289, 380	439, 380	60, 000
Nebraska	69	458, 840	135, 571	594, 441	33	224, 859	291, 227	516, 086	130, 000
Nevada	35	585, 277	125, 000	710, 277	18	195, 000	195, 000	390, 000	50, 000
New Hampshire	22	300, 000	100, 000	400, 000	42	152, 015	543, 576	695, 591	75, 000
New Jersey	191	7, 461, 502	0	7, 461, 502	149	869, 504	1, 667, 702	2, 537, 806	80, 000
New Mexico	23	277, 216	0	277, 216	32	284, 750	321, 697	606, 447	10, 000
New York	32	824, 197	575, 000	1, 399, 197	153	946, 729	3, 084, 861	4, 031, 590	800, 000
North Carolina	80	1, 197, 619	194, 514	1, 392, 133	496	4, 031, 893	425, 609	4, 457, 502	750, 000
North Dakota	14	385, 975	0	385, 975	29	256, 663	303, 463	560, 126	50, 000
Ohio	571	10, 779, 182	3, 741, 244	14, 520, 426	90	92, 801	2, 091, 598	2, 184, 399	30, 000
Oklahoma	239	2, 488, 658	197, 204	2, 685, 862	126	1, 085, 072	1, 294, 476	2, 379, 548	50, 000
Oregon	160	2, 550, 000	460, 000	3, 010, 000	36	250, 771	783, 086	1, 033, 857	55, 000
Pennsylvania	385	6, 520, 320	525, 040	7, 045, 360	112	461, 194	2, 005, 122	2, 466, 316	800, 000
Rhode Island	53	710, 000	540, 000	1, 250, 000	16	20, 000	318, 000	338, 000	80, 000
South Carolina	85	1, 370, 318	159, 377	1, 529, 695	93	687, 699	782, 127	1, 469, 826	200, 000
South Dakota	54	362, 420	171, 732	534, 152	17	123, 975	161, 678	285, 653	60, 000
Tennessee	550	6, 210, 053	835, 192	7, 045, 245	173	1, 976, 493	414, 481	2, 340, 974	350, 000
Texas	300	3, 000, 000	210, 000	3, 210, 000	144	0	3, 616, 372	3, 616, 372	190, 000
Utah	65	1, 051, 264	185, 517	1, 236, 781	23	339, 341	242, 051	581, 392	32, 000
Vermont	16	307, 112	0	307, 112	16	177, 740	103, 303	281, 046	16, 000
Virginia	130	3, 585, 772	0	3, 585, 772	96	1, 290, 238	73, 813	1, 364, 051	145, 000
Washington	491	18, 492, 423	1, 495, 184	19, 987, 607	80	647, 413	1, 583, 868	2, 231, 281	150, 000
West Virginia	115	1, 986, 291	2, 752	1, 989, 043	27	285, 391	604, 503	809, 894	25, 000
Wisconsin	2, 548	26, 705, 053	11, 987, 329	28, 692, 382	121	698, 304	1, 991, 157	2, 689, 461	436, 000
Wyoming	600	4, 688, 865	812, 399	5, 501, 264	15	123, 239	189, 389	312, 628	150, 000
Total	11, 339	172, 991, 172	21, 018, 054	194, 010, 199	4, 131	30, 609, 690	51, 136, 621	81, 746, 311	10, 358, 544

With all of these facts in mind, we will now turn to the witnesses from the American Vocational Association who are led today by their outstanding executive director, Lowell Burkett.

We will start with you, Mr. Burkett, and reserve our questions until we hear the entire testimony.

Go right ahead, Mr. Burkett.

[The prepared statements of Lowell A. Burkett and George R. Quarles follow:]

STATEMENT OF

LOWELL A. BURKETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

ACCOMPANIED BY

DAN DUNHAM, MARYLAND STATE DIRECTOR OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
AND
GEORGE QUARLES, CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR, OFFICE OF CAREER EDUCATION, BROOKLYN

BEFORE THE
SUB-COMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
OF THE
HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE
HONORABLE CARL PERKINS, CHAIRMAN

FEBRUARY 17, 1977
9:30 A.M.
2175 RAYBURN BUILDING

Mr. Chairman and members of the sub-committee:

I want to thank you on behalf of the American Vocational Association for the opportunity to present a statement concerning H.R.3437, a bill to amend the Education Amendments of 1976. We recognize the interest you have in perfecting Title II, the Vocational Education Amendments, of PL 94-482 and appreciate your sincere support for vocational education.

When the Education Amendments of 1976 (PL 94-482) were being considered by the Congress, there was considerable discussion regarding the purpose of federal assistance for vocational education. It was recognized that one of the primary purposes of federal assistance historically has been to improve the quality and quantity of vocational education programs available to the people of this nation. Federal assistance to vocational education has stimulated state and local interest and has provided a means whereby programs could utilize all resources to the best advantage. Federal assistance has stimulated innovation; it has also provided a means for state and local governments to monitor the quality of vocational education and it has provided assistance to local education agencies who would expand and improve programs of vocational education.

In line with this, the Congress in PL 94-482 stated that it was the purpose of federal assistance to vocational education to improve planning in the use of all resources available to them for vocational education and manpower training; to extend, improve and where necessary maintain existing programs; to develop new programs; to overcome sex discrimination and sex stereotyping in vocational education; to provide part-time employment for youth who need the earnings to continue their vocational training, so that persons of all ages can have ready access to training and re-training which is of high quality.

The purpose of the law as stated is well written and it is appropriate to the situation facing vocational education in the late 1970s. I do, however, share with

you some concerns that certain provisions of the law will not allow the state and local governmental agencies to fulfill the objectives and the purposes as written. For this reason, I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, that you and Mr. Quie have introduced amendments to PL 94-482. I will address these amendments and other areas of concern that the American Vocational Association has identified which are:

1) Provisions for federal funds for state administration of vocational education.
2) Provisions for federal funds for local administration of vocational education.
3) The allocation of a percentage (20%) of the basic state grant for program improvement and supportive services.
4) The need to clarify the date of implementation of the new law.

I hope we can discuss in depth the state and local administration today. Since I am not sure whether the other two issues require amendments to the law or not, I will simply place them before you for consideration.

State Administration

Under the provisions of PL 94-482, Section 102(d), state administrative costs are to be taken from a separate authorization of $25 million annually. The purpose of this section is to authorize funds for preparing the five year comprehensive state plan, preparing the annual program plan and accountability report including necessary data; conducting evaluations and funding state administration of vocational education. In addition, it is to be remembered that the law requires states to match federal expenditures for administration at the rate of 80%-20% for FY 78, 60%-40% for FY 79 and 50%-50% thereafter.

Since enactment of the law, we have identified several problems that will drastically hinder the delivery of vocational education in many states unless adjustments

85-808 O - 77 - 3

are made to the law. One of these problems is that the $25 million which is the total authorization in Section 102(d), even if fully funded, would not adequately meet the current requirements for the federal share of expenditures for state administration. In response to a survey conducted by the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education, approximately $51 million of federal funds are used to match approximately $81 million of state funds for administration. This means that 62.6% of the total administrative expenses during FY 76 were taken from the federal dollar leaving 37.4% funded by state monies. The state share of administrative cost in FY 76 more than met the requirements outlined in PL 94-482 for FY 78 and while it will not meet the requirements mandated for FY 80 and beyond, it is an indication that most states are prepared to assume their fair share of the responsibility for administering vocational education.

The new vocational education amendments call for comprehensive planning to meet the vocational education needs in each state. Great responsibilities are placed upon the State Board for Vocational Education to coordinate this planning and administer federal and state funds in accordance with the plan. Strong leadership will be required at the state level during the development of these plans and to follow through with quality programs in each and every community within the state. In addition to the greatly expanded planning requirements, PL 94-482 calls for each state to evaluate each program within the state during the period covered by the five year plan. The ability to stimulate data collection and accurate evaluations will depend upon the leadership coming from the State Board for Vocational Education. Extensive new requirements are placed upon this leadership. The innovative concept of PL 94-482 was built around these requirements and it is my belief that the new vocational education amendments will accomplish their purpose only if strong state and local leadership is encouraged.

With this in mind, it appears restrictive, therefore, for federal legislation to require both a matching provision for state administration and a limitation on the amount of funds that are to be available from the federal government. The 50-50 state-federal match required by law ensures state participation. Further, in a time when funds are scarce and priorities must be established it should not be mandated that vocational education seek increased funds specifically to provide administrative technical assistance and state leadership for programs both desired by Congress and supported with federal funds.

This sub-committee and other members of Congress have a strong interest in providing vocational education for all people. The mandates contained in the vocational education amendments seek new direction and a new thrust for vocational education. There are requirements that state and local programs better serve the disadvantaged, unemployed and underemployed youth and adult. In addition, there are requirements that whatever sex biases may be found in vocational education are to be eliminated, that improved guidance and counseling programs are necessary and that the total supportive and program improvement services are to be expanded in order to assure vocational education that addresses the economic and social needs of people. These mandates of Congress will be seriously curtailed without full implementation of the concepts of comprehensive planning based upon data gathered and evaluations made that are contained in the law. These concepts cannot be enacted with limitations on state and local leadership as currently written.

Recommendations

In light of the above statements, it is recommended that federal funding for state administration be removed from the purposes of Section 102(d) and be placed under the uses of basic state grant funds, Subpart 2, Section 120(b)(1). It is understood that this is one of the purposes of H.R.3437. I support this wholeheartedly.

Local Administration

Prior to the passage of the Education Amendments of 1976, 38 states utilized federal funds to pay some portion of the expenditures incurred in providing local administration for vocational education. Because of this, I was pleased when the original bill considered by this sub-committee (H.R.12835, which eventually led to the enactment of PL 94-482) contained language permitting the use of federal funds for local administration. In addition, we watched closely the corresponding Senate bill (S.2657) and I was pleased that it contained local administration in the definition of vocational education. With this as background, I believe it would be fair to say that Congress recognized the need for qualified local administrators and was interested in providing initiative in the form of federal funds to assure quality leadership at the local level.

The Senate-House conference between the two documents leading up to PL 94-482 eliminated the provision for utilizing federal funds for local administration. I am sure that Congress will want to pursue their intent and amend the law to provide incentives for qualified local leadership.

There currently appears to be no established pattern within the states for utilizing federal funds to support local administration. Many states have assumed responsibility for funding a portion of the local administrators salary while others look to the local education agency. My own personal experience addresses this issue as one of maintaining quality programs of vocational education through quality leadership. In the past, the State Board for Vocational Education has, in many states, provided state and federal funds to local school districts who identify and employ qualified vocational administrators. This has been used as a temporary incentive in some states while in others, it has been used to assure a quality program when the local school district could not afford the total financial responsibility of

vocational education. While there is no apparent pattern within the states for funding local administration, it is apparent that 38 of the states depend to some degree upon the federal, state and local partnership to assure quality leadership at the local level.

In the survey undertaken by the state directors mentioned earlier, it was learned that $21 million of federal funds were spent to provide local leadership for vocational education in FY 76. In addition, the states reporting indicated that they had spent a total of $172.9 million of state and local funds for local administration. This means that on the average 10% of the funds utilized to provide local leadership were coming from the federal appropriation. Since there is no provision in the vocational education amendments for funding local administration, this would be a dramatic, perhaps a paralyzing reduction in federal support for local leadership and would no doubt have the detrimental effect of reducing quality vocational education in many districts and local communities.

Recommendation

It is recommended that PL 94-482 be amended so that the definition of vocational education will include local administration. This would in fact then provide that funds from Section 102(a) could be utilized to provide local leadership. This sub-committee may wish to place restrictions upon funding of local administration similar to those placed upon state administration (50-50 match). This, in my opinion, would not prohibit quality program growth and development and would discourage irresponsible use of federal funds within the states.

Program Improvement and Supportive Services

While I indicated that this issue may not take an amendment to the law, I do feel it is important to address the fact that Section 103(e) of PL 94-482 indicates

that 20% of the basic state grant will be utilized in this area. I again address the idea of comprehensive planning mandated by the vocational education amendments and suggest that it should be the intent of this section to place a minimum of 20% of the basic state grant within the area of program improvement and supportive services. I am informed by many state directors of vocational education that an absolute 20% would require them to reduce their current allocations in this area. I am sure this is not the intent of the law nor was it visualized by Congress. Subpart 3 of PL 94-482 contains authorizations that have long been critical to the development of vocational education. Pre-service and in-service teacher education, research, curriculum development and innovative programs are all a necessary component of vocational education and should be allocated funds in accordance with needs identified in the states. In addition, the new section on vocational guidance and counseling must be a part of the state plan if the problems of satisfactory employment and human development are to be addressed.

If the language of PL 94-482 does in fact require an absolute 20% to be expended in this area, then I would hope that the Chairman would consider an amendment. If, on the other hand, this can be interpreted as a minimum of 20% to be expended in this Subpart, then I feel an amendment would not be needed.

Date of Implementation of PL 94-482

I am aware that the effective date of this law is October 1, 1977. In addition, I am aware that the Administration has proposed PL 94-482 be funded effective July 1, 1977. There is considerable confusion in the states regarding the development of state plans and procedures to follow in order to adequately administer federal monies appropriated for vocational education. I hope that early passage of H.R.3437 will resolve the issue of the effective date of the new law and appropriations can be enacted accordingly.

The attached charts have been developed from a survey made by the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education. They provide background data for some of the statements I have made and should give an indication of the situation faced by the states regarding funding of local and state administration. While the information is reported in accordance with each state's interpretation, I hope it is useful.

Please feel free to call upon the American Vocational Association for any further assistance. Thank you for your consideration.

EXPENDITURES FOR LOCAL AND STATE ADMINISTRATION FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

	LOCAL ADMINISTRATION				STATE ADMINISTRATION				
STATE	FTE*	STATE/LOCAL	FEDERAL	TOTAL	FTE	STATE	FEDERAL	TOTAL	ADD'L FOR PLANNING
ALABAMA	104	1,486,437	155,448	1,641,885	115	1,063,357	1,399,501	2,462,858	658,817
ALASKA	7	209,000	--	209,000	11	128,110	253,559	381,669	20,000
ARIZONA	36	249,570	546,185	795,755	51	263,652	858,757	1,122,403	250,000
ARKANSAS	71	2,369,897	723,276	3,093,173	55	275,412	763,017	1,038,429	485,000
CALIFORNIA	1263	13,285,532	1,476,170	14,761,702	147	None	6,370,080	6,370,080	300,000
COLORADO	131	2,331,299	None	2,331,299	57	148,907	1,201,710	1,350,617	281,027
CONNECTICUT	50	1,600,000	240,000	1,840,000	110	2,089,668	655,931	2,745,599	200,000
DELAWARE	11	285,000	None	285,000	21	210,981	268,848	479,829	16,000
FLORIDA	123	1,845,000	None	1,845,000	155	306,212	4,389,491	4,695,703	148,500
GEORGIA	510	4,396,511	624,283	5,020,794	99	944,960	919,620	1,864,580	170,000
HAWAII		None	None		16	163,309	141,874	305,183	40,000
IDAHO	44	593,245	96,755	690,000	44	614,698	None	614,698	100,000
ILLINOIS	400	1,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	84	974,197	1,305,243	2,279,440	500,000
INDIANA	100	1,188,985	714,480	1,903,465	61	445,608	848,856	1,294,464	500,000
IOWA	475	4,828,234	761,294	5,589,528	67	636,885	636,886	1,273,771	127,300
KANSAS	75	645,764	248,371	894,135	26	262,296	306,505	568,801	75,000
KENTUCKY	81	2,005,460	None	2,005,460	289	3,335,515	671,412	4,006,927	225,000
LOUISIANA	56	421,645	448,479	870,124	56	440,000	229,000	669,000	250,000
MAINE	49	726,792	55,000	781,792	34	241,333	289,885	531,218	200,000

*FTE - Full Time Equivalent

	LOCAL ADMINISTRATION				STATE ADMINISTRATION				
STATE	FTE	STATE/LOCAL	FEDERAL	TOTAL	FTE	STATE	FEDERAL	TOTAL	ADD'L FOR PLANNING
MARYLAND	128	3,081,837	123,069	3,204,906	50	535,388	576,762	1,112,150	210,000
MASSACHUSETTS	611	5,538,188	None	5,538,188	120	234,537	1,602,507	1,837,044	127,900
MICHIGAN	196	9,433,412	357,189	9,790,601	95	667,703	1,736,054	2,403,757	250,000
MINNESOTA	263	8,350,000	750,000	9,100,000	66	167,061	785,950	953,011	250,000
MISSISSIPPI	109	1,751,991	177,145	1,929,136	84	1,116,563	364,355	1,480,918	100,000
MISSOURI	175	2,786,595	34,640	2,821,235	62	22,651	1,183.279	1,205,930	100,000
MONTANA	25	283,421	33,188	316,609	19	150,000	289,380	439,380	60,000
NEBRASKA	69	458,840	135,571	594,411	33	224,859	291,227	516,086	130,000
NEVADA	35	585,277	125,000	710,277	18	195,000	195,000	390,000	50,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE	22	300,000	100,000	400,000	42	152,015	543,576	695,591	75,000
NEW JERSEY	191	7,461,502	None	7,461,502	149	869,104	1,667,702	2,536,806	80,000
NEW MEXICO	23	277,216	None	277,216	32	284,750	321,697	606,447	10,000
NEW YORK	32	824,197	575,000	1,399,197	153	946,729	3,084,861	4,031,590	800,000
NORTH CAROLINA	80	1,197,619	194,514	1,392,133	496	4,031,893	425,609	4,457,502	750,000
NORTH DAKOTA	14	385,975	None	385,975	29	256,663	303,463	560,126	50,000
OHIO	571	10,779,182	3,741,244	14,520,426	90	92,801	2,091,598	2,184,399	30,000
OKLAHOMA	239	2,488,658	197,204	2,685,862	126	1,085,072	1,294,476	2,379,548	50,000
OREGON	160	2,550,000	460,000	3,010,000	36	250,771	783,086	1,033,857	55,000
PENNSYLVANIA	385	6,520,320	525,040	7,045,360	112	461,194	2,005,122	2,466,316	800,000

	LOCAL ADMINISTRATION				STATE ADMINISTRATION				
STATE	FTE	STATE/LOCAL	FEDERAL	TOTAL	FTE	STATE	FEDERAL	TOTAL	ADD'L FOR PLANNING
RHODE ISLAND	53	710,000	540,000	1,250,000	16	20,000	318,000	338,000	80,000
SOUTH CAROLINA	85	1,370,318	159,377	1,529,695	93	687,699	782,127	1,469,826	200,000
SOUTH DAKOTA	54	362,420	171,732	534,152	17	123,975	161,678	285,653	60,000
TENNESSEE	550	6,210,053	835,192	7,045,245	173	1,926,493	414,481	2,340,974	350,000
TEXAS	300	3,000,000	210,000	3,210,000	144	None	3,616,372	3,616,372	190,000
UTAH	65	1,051,264	185,517	1,236,781	23	339,341	242,051	581,392	32,000
VERMONT	16	307,112	None	307,112	16	177,743	103,303	281,046	16,000
VIRGINIA	130	3,585,772	None	3,585,772	96	1,290,238	73,813	1,364,051	145,000
WASHINGTON	491	18,492,423	1,495,184	19,987,607	80	647,413	1,583,868	2,231,281	150,000
WEST VIRGINIA	115	1,986,291	2,752	1,989,043	27	285,391	604,503	809,894	25,000
WISCONSIN	2548	26,705,053	1,987,329	28,692,382	121	698,304	1,991,157	2,689,461	436,000
WYOMING	600	4,688,865	812,399	5,501,264	15	123,239	189,389	312,628	150,000
TOTALS	11921	172,991,172	21,018,054	194,010,199	4131	30,609,690	51,136,621	81,746,311	10,358,544

Prepared by the National Association of
State Directors of Vocational Education
1510 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

[The following letter was submitted after conclusion of the hearings.]

American Vocational Association Inc. 1510 H Street N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202-737-3722)

AVA

March 14, 1977

The Honorable Carl Perkins
Chairman, House Education and
Labor Committee
Rayburn House Office Bldg.
Room 2365
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Perkins:

I want to take this opportunity to personally thank you for your interest in proposing amendments to PL 94-482 and proceeding with hearings on technical amendments for vocational education. The opportunity to testify before your subcommittee on February 17 was greatly appreciated.

In line with this, I wish to amend the prepared statement submitted in testimony before your subcommittee on February 17. In essence, the correction I wish to make is to delete the first two paragraphs on page 5. I am making this request following a search of the legislative history which indicated incorrect statements in those two paragraphs.

Thank you for your continued support of vocational education. Please feel free to call upon my office for whatever assistance we can provide.

Sincerely yours,

Lowell A. Burkett
Executive Director

LAB:cb
Attachment - Corrected Statement

LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

There currently appears to be no established pattern within the states for utilizing federal funds to support local administration. Many states have assumed responsibility for funding a portion of the local administrators salary while others look to the local education agency. My own personal experience addresses this issue as one of maintaining quality programs of vocational education through quality leadership. In the past, the State Board for Voc. Ed. has, in many states, provided state and federal funds to local school districts who identify and employ qualified vocational administrators. This has been used as a temporary incentive in some states while in others, it has been used to assure a quality program when the local school district could not afford the total financial responsibility of

Corrected Page 5 as submitted in testimony on February 17.

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND SUPPORT
CENTER FOR CAREER AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11201
855-5122

GEORGE R. QUARLES
CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR

VINCENT A. TROIANO
DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR

STATEMENT ON IMPORTANCE OF VEA FUNDING FOR LOCAL ADMINISTRATION
FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN URBAN AREAS

PRESENTED TO

THE HOUSE SUB-COMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY AND
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

February 17, 1977

By

GEORGE R. QUARLES, CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR
CENTER FOR CAREER AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

IMPORTANCE OF VEA FUNDING FOR LOCAL ADMINISTRATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN LARGE URBAN AREAS

Before VEA, Vocational Education in New York City functioned as a patch-work quilt operation, lacking the leadership and management support to render it comprehensive and cost effective. Other large urban centers were undoubtedly affected in much the same way.

Legislative provisions provided the long awaited incentive and support for management operations, which could insure at least a dollar for dollar return on vocational education funds. In fact, in New York City, VEA funds have had a multiplier effect, both with regard to the innovative programs which it has made possible, and the mechanisms which it supported to perform the needed management functions. Needs assessments, short and long range planning, curriculum development, staff development, management and leadership -- all of those functions which enable the delivery of services to students, depend upon the management system.

Research, made possible by VEA, enabled the system to effect change not spontaneously, but deliberately based upon knowledge. Equally important, is the accountability which VEA enabled the management system to institute. Monitoring and evaluation processes have served not only as ongoing management tools, but also as a means of developing summative judgments on programs.

The interest of New York City students in vocational education programs has grown sharply, with the result that more than 10,000 students must be turned away each year. With VEA funds, we have been able to plan and develop alternatives, so that these students will not go unserved. Innovative programs such as After School Occupational Skills, and Shared Instruction have helped us to close the gap.

Innovative VEA programs of proven value, have been incorporated into the school system's regular services. In the final analysis it is the management which directs the judicious use of VEA funds. It is this management which directs the articulation of programs, prevent duplication, and has the capability of coordinating all services in a comprehensive system.

State administrative supports which are threatened in the new legislation, have provided great benefits to the local education communities. This support should be preserved in the Federal law.

The fiscal crises which grip most urban centers, and New York City especially, make it impossible to fund the administrative services from local sources. Without federal support, the benefits of VEA programs would be in serious jeopardy.

STATEMENT OF LOWELL A. BURKETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION; ACCOMPANIED BY DANIEL DUNHAM, STATE DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION, MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; AND GEORGE QUARLES, CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR, OFFICE OF CAREER EDUCATION, BOARD OF EDUCATION, NEW YORK

Mr. BURKETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. We appreciate the excellent leadership that this committee has given in perfecting Public Law 94–482. We believe that it is good legislation. It will help to expand and improve the program of vocational education.

We also appreciate your willingness to look at the legislation and to make such technical amendments as necessary so that the purposes of the act can be carried out to our best advantage.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we applaud the purposes of this act. I think we need to look at those very carefully as we consider the administration of the program. The purpose is to improve planning, to expand, improve and, where necessary, maintain programs, develop new programs, to overcome sex discrimination, sex stereotyping, and provide student support for those students who need the support in vocational education.

Our concern is that certain provisions in this act will affect the States and local communities in carrying out these purposes. We certainly want to do all that we possibly can to achieve the purposes set forth by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have examined the technical amendments that are in H.R. 3437 and believe that you have detected most of the changes that will be necessary. However, I have some concern about one or two of them.

Chairman PERKINS. Go right ahead.

Mr. BURKETT. The local and State administrators will have the major responsibility for the comprehensive planning that is called for in this legislation. This is going to take some astute leadership from people at those levels to accomplish that purpose, because it is going to involve working with many agencies, many types of programs that we have not worked with before.

For that reason, the responsibility of the administrator is going to be greater than it has ever been before.

In this legislation, another thing that is called for is the evaluation or accountability. It is going to call for a considerable amount of evaluation of the programs, the followup, working with employers to see how well the students have been trained. It is going to call for involvement with many agencies and advisory committee, particularly at the local level, which is spelled out in the law.

So again, I want to reemphasize the fact that administration and leadership is going to be a factor in the implementation of this act to accomplish the purpose that Congress has set forth, and which we applaud. We believe that the provision in the act for $25 million for planning that contains the State administration is not adequate. Our survey, which is in the testimony, indicates that much more money is

currently being spent—Federal money—that is in the $25 million with the added responsibility for planning and evaluation that is called for in the act. This would not at all satisfy the needs.

We applaud the fact that in your proposed amendments to H.R. 3437 that you remove the State administration from section 102(d), section 102(a), because that will provide the States the money that is needed to administrate the funds. We believe the 50-50 matching set forth in the law will be the factor that will help to hold down the use of Federal funds for administration and keep it in balance. We applaud that.

We are concerned, however, about the fact that both the House bill and the Senate bill did make provisions for local administration, but we came to the conference and the local administration was left out. We are wondering why.

Really, the real responsibility for carrying out the evaluation, particularly in the planning, will be at the local level, so there is a great need for it. Some States have taken the State and local moneys to do that administration. However, due to the fact that most State legislatures will not be meeting, it will be difficult, within only a 2-year period, difficult for some of them to take on that responsibility.

I think you are going to find that local administration will be hurt in some States, not in every State. For that reason we would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the committee would consider the possibility of including the use of 102(a) funds in local administration where that is necessary.

Another concern that we have—we are not sure that it is going to require any legislative changes, but it may need some clarification—is when you say that you want to improve, to expand programs, the improvement will come through research, exemplary programs, and teacher training or inservice and preservice teacher training.

We are concerned that the 20 percent supportive services, the 20 percent basic grant for supportive services, may stifle some States in improving their programs, because there is a great need for inservice and preservice teacher training, upgrading standards to make them so that they can handle the programs of today.

We would hope that there would be some clarification and hope that the 20 percent would actually be a minimum rather than just a set amount of that.

Again, in the planning process, if it is done well, some States may use less, some may use more. To restrain the States from doing that may affect the quality of programs in some States.

Another concern that I have in the proposed amendments is the fact that you have taken State administration out of section 150 for home economics. I am fearful that what will happen in some States, that it will eliminate their State leadership in home economics. If there is only one program which needs strong leadership to make the changes necessary in the program, it would be home economics.

I would hope that you would continue to keep that in section 150. I notice that it has been removed and I would imagine that it was done because of the fact that you were placing administration over in section 102(a).

One of the reasons why vocational education has been able to expand and improve is the leadership and technical assistance given by the

85-808 O - 77 - 5

State and local administrators. I sincerely hope that you will restore that into the legislation.

To me, Federal legislation, Federal support, has been the stimulus that has caused State and local communities to invest in the program and I would hope that you would do everything that you possibly can to stimulate those things that is going to do better planning, is going to improve the program and expand the program, because that is where the Federal dollars are really paying off at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, that is my brief statement or summary of what I have in my statement and I have with me a couple of gentlemen that I would like to have make a few comments.

First I have Mr. Dan Dunham, State director, Division of Vocational-Technical Education of Maryland. I would like for him to make a few comments.

Chairman PERKINS. Keep in mind whether you are spending any of the public funds in local education and what would happen if we did not make that permissible in the future.

Mr. DUNHAM. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I would like to clarify and concur with what Mr. Burkett has suggested to you as some of the key provisions of the bill, that you have introduced to make technical amendments to the existing law.

We welcome, first of all, the accountability dimensions of this new law. It has been too long in coming.

I think that if those are going to become realities, we must, indeed, have the capacity at the State and local levels to carry out the intent and mandates for accountability that are woven throughout this very excellent law.

With regard to the State administration issue, I concur again with the statements of Mr. Burkett. In our State, the proposed allocation funds, based upon the present level, would cause us, at the State level, to fall about $100,000 short of being able to maintain our administrative cost level, in terms of using Federal funds, even though we are currently matching at a 50–50 percent rate for State administration and have, for some years, in the State of Maryland.

The local administration issue is a critical issue, perhaps more so in other States than Maryland, as you can see by the data that is before you.

In our case, approximately $125,000 is currently being spent for local administration. Portions of the salaries and support cost for administrators number 128. These are people who are local county supervisors, coordinators of vocational education, area local technical center directors, and deans of occupational education in community colleges.

By and large it would affect, not drastically but significantly, the capacity to support the efforts of the local level, to eliminate the capacity in the law for use of the funds to pay portions of the cost of local administration.

It is my view that the local administration area in vocational education has been the primary reason that we have had progress and success with the programs that we do have.

I do think we need an amendment to include this as a part of the instruction, because it is instructional support. Without it, much would not get done at the local level; much of what we are doing very well would be compartmentalized and fragmented rather than being co-

ordinated and giving us the capacity of broad-based programs as opposed to single-tracking types of programs.

There are only two or three other issues, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, that I would like to point out.

Again, in support of what Mr. Burkett has said, in the area of improvement of support services, the limit of 20 percent is a serious limit. In fact, in almost every State with whom I have visited over the last several months—in our own case, the whole issue of improving programs, curriculum and teacher education research, exemplary, et cetera, has been a high priority for us.

Of our six priorities for vocational education in the State, curriculum development as a method of improving programs and personnel development as a vehicle for carrying that out are top priorities. As a matter of fact, under the provisions of this law as presently constructed, we would cut almost in half the level of supportive services that we are able to provide in that part of the act which is popularly called subpart (3). That is a 20 percent.

There is a related issue that has to do with the set-asides of our disadvantage, handicapped, and proposed secondary. Under the present reading of the law, those issues appear to be aimed only at instructional programs. We have no capacity to draw on those funds for related supportive services for disadvantaged, handicapped, and post-secondary programs, because they are in another part of the formula.

In fact, that is carving this money up. I suggest very strongly that we be able to deal with the set-asides in a way similar in the manner exactly the same as the rest of the money, which is that there should be 20 percent, at least as a minimum, of those set-asides available for program improvement purposes.

As a matter of fact, the most important issue that we have in our State today with regard to the disadvantaged and handicapped is the preparation of teachers and counselors who deal with those who have special needs, the handicapped, disadvantaged, in the regular program of vocational education, and we are simply going to be hamstrung in doing this if we do not have the capacity to reach into those dollars to do some things that we have been doing all along—they have been good things, I assure you—to improve the capacities of those teachers to deal with those students who have those special needs.

I am suggesting, along with the amendments proposed in this resolution, that you clarify the splitting of funds to the end that we can excess the disadvantaged and handicapped moneys at some percentage level is—I suggest 20 percent, as perhaps in this case, a maximum as opposed to a minimum, so we can have those developmental activities taking place there.

As a final point, I do concur with the comment about home economics. In our State, we would have a tough time justifying spending vocational educational dollars or State administration dollars for home economics. It is not a vocational education program; it is a consumer and homemaking program.

That is why it is a separate part of the law as it is.

I strongly urge you to place the capacity to spend dollars out of home economics for State administration, because it is a unique program. In my case, we simply could not support State-level staff in terms of our policies and procedures within the law.

Frankly, for home economics State administration, we do not have enough wage-earning programs relating to the homemaking field to classify them as occupational in nature, wage-earning in nature, to support a full-time staff member. In fact, the consumer homemaking area would go down the drain, because we have half State funding, but that is not going to buy a full-time person.

Those are the basic issues that I am concerned about. I would be happy to respond to any questions that you might have, after Mr. Quarles is finished his comments.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we have Mr. George Quarles, director of Career Education for the city of New York.

Mr. QUARLES. Thank you very much for allowing me to testify today. I am testifying not only as a local director who is, in fact, on the firing line, who every day must look at the impact of our Federal funds upon the instructional program. I testify as a member of the executive board of the National Association of Large City Directors of Vocational Education.

This involves 70 cities throughout the country. Every State is represented on the council. My statement, I think, probably reflects the dilemma that we find ourselves in at this particular time.

A few years ago, I had the privilege to testify here about the impact of the VEA funds on city programs. I mentioned how they expand the options for youth, how they allow tax-levied funds to be really expended so that they reached into the heart of the problem that we had in preparing youth and adults for employment.

As those 1976 amendments were being drafted, I did talk to my colleagues. I was very much heartened, because it looked like for once we could really move toward our major problem, that is, rendering youth and adults employable.

I was extremely pleased when the bill was passed. Then I became shocked, because I heard from my State director that no funds would be allowed for local administration.

This, in New York City—and, I suspect, in many other large cities—is devastating. I do not need to talk to you about the problems that we have with tax-levied funds in New York City. We are threatened with another $38 million cut in the Board of Education and I hope that it is not going to affect the tax-levied funds that we are working with now in vocational education. I suspect that it will not.

One of the strengths that the VEA has allowed us to develop in the city is a strong management system. When I first came into the city 5 years ago, we had a patchwork quilt situation. Everybody, in fact, was doing what they wanted to do, with no leadership.

In 5 years, we were able to put together an organization utilizing VEA funds that allowed us to do some of the things in support of the instructional program that I think are essential: No. 1, comprehensive planning; No. 2, we were able to develop programs that reflect the needs of business and industry. We are in the process of redesigning curriculum, giving technical assistance to the schools in our cities, modernizing and updating equipment.

The very first effort that was made in the city was to develop a needs assessment to find out where we were and where we needed to go. We

have designed alternative methods of delivery of vocational education because we have a heavy demand for occupational education in New York City.

Annually, we have 10,000 students who are not able to get into vocational schools. That means we have to develop programs to allow these students to get vocational education and be employable as a result.

In essence, we have vastly improved the quality of vocational education in New York City. One of the efforts that was lacking in the past was job-market surveys. Where are the jobs? What kind of training should we be doing?

We have been involved in program monitoring and evaluation and the new act, as Lowell and Dan Dunham did mention, is going to be an increasing responsibility. We have been able to make an analysis of why youth are dropping out of high school and determine what should we do for those youth who are dropping out.

We are engaged in job placement and followup activities. We are coordinating our programs with ones on the adult and secondary level, and eliminating duplication.

In short, I do not want to return to the days of patchwork that was characterized by lack of planning, by sporadic staff development, by lack of curriculum development, duplication of effort, decisionmaking on the seat of our pants rather than hard, concrete data by which we could make decisions that would help move the city in the direction we think it needs to go; insufficient programs to meet the needs of the population.

I am sure that my colleagues throughout the country want to continue to give leadership and direction to vocational education in large cities. There is still much work to be done. I want to continue that work. We need those funds for local administration. We are not going to get tax-levied funds to allow us to expand in that particular area.

If the funds are discontinued, as I said earlier, it will devastate the many things that have been developed in the city that I would like to see continue and I do support the testimony of my colleagues here and I do hope that consideration will be given to the needs of the large cities for local administration funded through the Vocational Education Act. Thank you.

Mr. BURKETT. That concludes our testimony.

Mr. LEFANTE. Thank you, gentlemen. I have a few questions that I would like to address myself to.

Perhaps you should bear in mind the purpose of this hearing, which is to focus on the various alternatives for providing some Federal assistance for local administration.

As Chairman Perkins indicated earlier in his welcoming remarks this morning, that is why we are here today.

Am I to assume that all three of you gentlemen think that the comprehensive plan should be at the local level?

Mr. DUNHAM. Yes, sir, absolutely. That is where it starts.

State planning is essentially a reflection and an aggregation of local planning. It is more than that, but it is essentially giving a percentage, 75 to 80 percent of what is reflected in the master plans of vocational education, directly based on what happens at the local level, what they identify as their needs and priorities and issues.

We try to respond to that planning, all those pieces of information and data, in the comprehensive State planning.

This is different from what it has been in the past, but it has been coming for several years. Today, particularly, the emphasis in the new act, it really puts the pressure on the priority and responsibility for planning, depth planning, and using good information and data and good evaluation, using the results of that information at the local level, indeed.

Mr. QUARLES. I certainly would concur with the statement that was just made. I guess the very first thing we found was a lack of planning and lack of a cohesive direction, lack of goals, so everybody would say at least we know this is a goal, let us work towards it, so we did start to involve all facets of the community in our planning process. At least we are all going in the same direction: hopefully, that is forward and not back. I think that is important.

Mr. LEFANTE. I agree. I think Mr. Perkins made it very clear in his presentation this morning, but coming from a very highly urbanized district, I can appreciate your experience in New York.

I am very staunchly in support of the democratic process of the whole concept. The local leadership can handle local problems and know what the problems of the community are in that surrounding. But in the comprehensive planning, like everything else that the government gets involved with, there will be regulations and guidelines.

I think even before you get to the local level, the emphasis should be put on the effect of regulations and guidelines. Too often, we, as legislators, make it almost impossible for local governments to comply with the mandate that we set for them. As a result of this we end up throwing good money after bad. All too often a dollar value is placed on quality.

On pages 5 and 6 of your statement, the last paragraph on page 5 and all of page 6, you talk about the need in regard to local programs. Would you elaborate on that?

You talk about there being no established patterns. Established patterns eventually develop precedents. In many cases, laws are written as a result of precedent. The courts rule as a result of precedent.

I think that is very important. If I may impose upon you, sir, I would like you to elaborate on those two areas. I do not quite understand what you are trying to tell us there.

Mr. BURKETT. Apparently some states——

Mr. LEFANTE. Let me clarify that. First, you are telling us that there is no established pattern.

Mr. BURKETT. What I am referring to is the chart. If you would look at the chart at the end, you will find that is varies, as Chairman Perkins said, on no moneys at all, no Federal moneys at all, going into local administration to a large percentage. I think the largest one I find is probably about 68 percent of local administrative costs that are coming from Federal money. That would be from the State of Arizona.

So there is no established pattern of using Federal funds for local administration, and it varies, I guess, with the commitment that the State has made to local use of local funds and State funds for administration.

I suppose there is an attitude that may exist in some States saying if Federal money comes in, we ought to use Federal money to administer. Maybe it is an attitudinal thing.

As you will see from that chart, there is quite a difference in the patterns that are used in these States for these Federal funds for local administration. I make the point again that it seems to me that if we want to accomplish what the purpose of this act is, we have to be sure that there is some kind of support to provide the quality of programs, do the planning, all the things necessary.

Mr. LEFANTE. As I see it, the pattern has been established as a result of your testimony this morning. Again, on page 6, you state that an average of 10 percent of the funds utilized to provide local leadership are coming from Federal appropriations, so to me, that is a starting point and I consider that as setting some sort of a pattern.

I think there was a very strong point made this morning with regard to local leadership and comprehensive planning. Certain areas require certain actions, and display of certain attitudes which cause certain actions.

As a result, I know the problems that I experienced in New Jersey may not be the case in Indiana. If an average of 10 percent of funds utilized to provide local leadership comes from Federal appropriations, is that a good figure or a bad figure? Is it enough or not enough on a national scale?

Mr. BURKETT. I think, in my testimony, I indicated that if it was placed under section 102(a), the basic grants would be left up to the States to determine what amount of Federal funds is necessary to carry on the local administration.

I would say this. I do not think there is any objection to requiring that the States match the Federal funds that they use in local administrations. That shows that the States are going to put some money into local administration. That has never been true in the past. That would accomplish some of the things that Congress is getting at.

They do not want to use all Federal funds for local administration. If you put it under section 102(a), basic grants, it would be left up to the States to determine how much they need to accomplish the purpose of this act.

Mr. LEFANTE. I know you travel quite a lot.

Could you tell me, briefly, what is the mood or attitude of the general public in regard to vocational education in the country?

What have you experienced?

What I am trying to get at is that in some of the areas of my district I keep hearing that there is too much funding for higher education. As a result, we have many schoolteachers and engineers and architects who cannot even get in the unemployment line to collect unemployment insurance because by the time they graduated from school there were no jobs available, so they have no credit.

I come from an area that has a serious unemployment problem. As of this morning, the highest rate of unemployment in the Nation was in Jersey City alone. I found that many of these youngsters are going from door to door to our local merchants looking for jobs to stock shelves in supermarkets and to deliver furniture from furniture trucks. There are schoolteachers and others—one is an architect, one has a degree in communications—who cannot get employment.

Yet, if we call a plumber we have to wait 3 or 4 days. If the dishwasher or washing machine breaks down, we have to make an appointment a week in advance, so there is a lack in some trades.

What is the mood of the country, in the Nation as a whole? Am I the only one experiencing something like this in my district, or is it the national scene?

Mr. BURKETT. It is national. You are expressing, I think, what I hear as I travel around the country.

The best indicator that we have is the increased support that State and local districts or agencies are giving to vocational education. The Federal support has not kept up proportionately with the State and local support.

Because a few years ago, it was about $4 of State and local money to every Federal dollar. Now it is about $6 of State and local money going into $1 Federal.

Mr. LEFANTE. Why is that?

Mr. BURKETT. Getting to your point that the local and State support for vocational education is increasing, something that people want.

We have increased the number of facilities, for example, almost every State has increased the number of facilities and programs. The growth in enrollment has been very substantial in recent years. We still have not kept up with the needs, as Mr. Quarles has indicated.

There are 10,000 students in New York City each year who are turned away from vocational education. The demand is there. We need the resources. We need the leadership. We need the planning, the improvement in programs to keep up with the need.

Mr. LEFANTE. About a week ago in a public hearing held in this room on career education there were gentlemen who testified before this committee that in their opinion the vocational educational system in this country is a complete flop. They said that if we address ourselves in the same or like manner to career education as we do to vocational education, that would be a flop.

That is what we were told. It is a matter of public record. It was rather disturbing to me to hear something like that, because usually in a position of responsibility, when you hear something like that you would like to place the blame somewhere.

Running that through your mind, you ask "where does the blame belong?" I sat here for 45 minutes; I could not put my finger on it.

If this attitude does exist throughout the country that the vocational system is a flop, where can the blame be placed, and what can we do to correct it?

Mr. BURKETT. This is one of the points I make. In increasing the amount of supportive services, I think that there is a need for better teaching, more inservice, preservice teacher training and upgrading of our personnel. That was my point for saying we should increase that amount.

I will have to admit that there are programs of vocational education that are not good. There needs to be an evaluation. We welcome the evaluation.

We are saying that we think we need to be accountable for it. We need leadership to provide the kinds of quality and the programs that we are struggling for.

Mr. LEFANTE. That comes from comprehensive planning at the local level?

Mr. BURKETT. Planning and evaluation accountability. Without that kind of leadership, you are not going to achieve the purposes of this act.

All that we are striving to do—there are programs that are not good. We know that. There are many that are good. I would say that a majority of them are.

I am glad that you are evaluating the program. I want to know where they are good and where they are bad so that we build up the good ones and get rid of the bad ones.

Mr. LEFANTE. All too often, instead of turning the other cheek, sometimes we turn our backs. I have been involved in some evaluation of educational programs. The results of these studies, showed there was an awful lot to be desired in the quality of instruction. Whenever someone tried to do something about it, they would run into a brick wall because of the political process, because of certain organizations and their lobbying power.

I think there is too much emphasis on the belief that dollars buy quality and that is not the case. Mr. Perkins has told me that we will be ready to address ourselves to the local funding issue shortly. That is the reason for these hearings.

I happen to endorse and support comprehensive planning at the local level. I happen to endorse this democratic process, the home rule process. There is no one that can explain better to you, to me, or to anyone else the problems of that district but the people of that district.

Bearing that in mind, I appreciate your patience with me this morning. I think we are learning together. We will do something about it.

That is all the questions I have. Next on the list is Congressman Goodling.

Do you have any questions?

Mr. GOODLING. First of all, I think in relationship to your question and their answer in relationship to now that it is 6 to 1, et cetera, that does not come as a surprise to the gentlemen that are sitting out there. They knew what was going to happen. What was going to happen, the purpose of the Federal program, Federal people getting involved to try to get them off dead center and try to get them to expand that and do something. You never go before a school board and say, let's do this because it is Federal money. You go before them and tell them, here is some Federal money.

You must understand after we get the program started that the Federal money is going to dry up. The whole purpose, of course, is just to stimulate new thinking and create ideas and so on. The Federal Government, of course, leads the way.

What in fact does happen, local government does get ahold of the program and makes the determinations as to how the program should go. I just wanted to point this out. I am sure that nobody out there was surprised that the Federal Government is backing away, because that is the purpose and that is the idea.

I do have a couple of questions in relationship to this whole business of State and local effort in relationship to local administration and State administration.

If you have the same amount of money this year as you had last year but last year you were spending, let us say, 60 percent of your money, your local money for programs, 40 percent of your Federal money for administration, where is the difference if you now spend that 40 percent for programs from the Federal Government and then must take some of the money that you were not spending for programs locally and put that into administration?

This money is so mixed, this vocational education money, if you just have a potfull, what does it matter whether it comes from the Federal Government or the local government in relationship to the local administration?

Where do you lose?

Mr. QUARLES. In New York City we spent over $100 million of tax levied funds for vocational education. The amount of Federal funds that comes into the city equals about $10 million.

The tax levied funds already have an established usage. In other words, they fund the school building, the principals, the instructors, to teach the kids.

The Federal funds come in. We look at new technology, we develop new programs, we expand, we improve the equipment, upgrade the curriculum and things of that nature in attempting to get them to move into the modern and the new. We do the planning and so forth.

Tax levied funds cannot be moved. We cannot take it from out of this pocket and put it into this pocket because it has already been designated for a specific use.

Mr. GOODLING. But if you move over to substitute where you are taking out local funds, is there a difference?

Mr. QUARLES. Well, the problem that we are having in New York City, if I suggest that we do that, then any new position becomes a tax levied position and I have to go before a group called "Big Mac" who is saying you are going to cut, so you ought to cut central headquarters anyhow. They will not approve any new positions in the tax levied ones.

Mr. GOODLING. What I am driving at, I would have to see the pupil expenditure of every State in relationship to State and local administration, which I do not happen to have.

For instance, if Maryland used 50 percent of the Federal funds for State and local administration, Pennsylvania uses 8 percent, then I would have to say per pupil expenditures to make this as clear as possible; but does that mean, for instance, that Pennsylvania is doing a poorer job than Maryland in supervision, or does Maryland have too many people on the payroll in relation to supervision?

Our concern is what happens to the youngster. Since I am using Maryland and my State, perhaps I should address this to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BURKETT. What is happening, the leadership in vocational education is trying to identify some of the weaknesses or the problems in that State in taking the Federal money in trying to help and improve the program by placing it where it will best improve the program. I guess that is the reason why perhaps in some States you will find more Federal money going into administration.

Mr. GOODLING. Some States did not use any funds.

Mr. BURKETT. That is right, because the States are willing to support that.

Mr. GOODLING. This is what I was getting at. Was it not a question—I think that we had a gentleman from California last week who testified that this was the only way they could get any kind of State supervision of their vocational education program, because the State would not support supervision of the vocational education program.

Mr. BURKETT. I have checked the California situation. As I understand it, they will be meeting the requirements of the 20 percent State money against 80 percent Federal money in 1978. Also, it is going to call for a reduction of State leadership. The State is not going to put very much money into it.

Again, you are going to affect the program in that State even with that kind of matching.

Mr. GOODLING. Assuming that more bodies make more effective leadership——

Mr. BURKETT. To do the kind of job that we are talking about, planning, evaluation, it is going to take some bodies.

Mr. DUNHAM. If I could respond, what is involved in what your line of questioning is taking, some of it relates to Mr. LeFante's question about the attitude of vocational education. There are 56 State jurisdictions, including the territories, and there is a different attitude in terms of the priority for State administration or local administration in virtually every one of those States that has to do with the kind of leadership that was there over the period of time in 1963 and a whole lot of other variables, the politics of the State, and so on.

To relate more specifically to your question, if one had the capacity to shift funding, if we did, one of the things we would have to be very careful about is supplanting funds. Once you establish, as Mr. Quarles has said, a local tax base and local contribution to vocational education, you may not supplant those funds with Federal dollars according to law.

We all understand that it is not a simple thing to spread the money around.

Although there are some stimulating things that could happen, if you are going to say that you take that line of thinking, about reducing administration and putting more of the money out where students are, in fact the new act does that to a good degree by the 80–20 concept and so on, although there are some limitations with that.

Let me give you an example.

In Maryland, for your information—I cannot give you per student costs off the top of my head, but in terms of State administration—we have held that to 4.7 percent of our appropriation for State administration. I always have the problem with the word administration because most of our people who are being paid by those funds are not administrators, they are program specialists, technical support people, and instruction related people, but that is a semantic problem; 92 percent of the support in the State of Maryland for vocational and technical education, which is about $110 million, State, Federal and local together, 92 percent of that per year is State and local money; 8 percent of it is Federal.

Indeed, sir, the Federal dollar has done what it was intended to do, to stimulate the whole business. Again, in response to your concern

and query regarding attitude, their was clearly attitude when you moved from $7 million being spent in 1965 to $110 million being spent 12 years later, there is a pretty positive attitude in support, and it is a direct reflection of the stimulation of the Federal dollar.

With that at the State level, a variety of attitudes from State to State—Virginia, for example, our neighbor to the south, no Federal money going into State administration. As a matter of fact, no money going into regular instructional programs. All State money.

They are going to use their Federal money for other purposes that are allowed in the law, for example, teacher education and instruction, as I was told last week by the State director there. There is a very strong commitment there, political commitment. It has evolved over a period of time; yet we in our State and most States are not that fortunate to have the State earmark money for vocational education State aid over the top of other State formula money that is coming for public education.

In terms of successfully and accurately administering those funds at both the State and local level, we have got to have the access to some of the Federal money to get this job done. What I am concerned about doing is having some equity at the local level with regard to that capacity to plan and develop and carry out programs. We have rich counties and poor counties in the State of Maryland.

The rich counties, when you do it all by project proposals and so on, are going to get a lot of the money, they write a better proposal because their planners are better and they can afford it. They are putting more local money into it.

The Federal dollars should help to put some equity in that by training local planners, how to do good planning, use data properly, et cetera. Those counties cannot afford that extra person to be a grantsman, a planner 100 percent of the time and the other things. We have got to help them.

It is not as easy as saying would 10 percent do it nationwide; 10 percent in our case might be quite adequate, it might be 50 or 60 percent in Ohio to get that kind of thing to happen.

I would be very cautious in my view of formulas, if you will, for local administration, but I think that there are enough reasonable people out there with these kinds of experiences, knowing that some things are done well and some things are not done very well, as a matter of fact.

Frankly, most of it relates to the lack of the use of data and good planning and then having a really good system for personnel development, teacher education and counselor education at the local level. If you want to put blame somewhere, I am not putting it at the local level. I am saying the total system that has components of local, regional and State and national has some weaknesses in it. Vocational guidance is one. Local planning and administration is one in some areas. Teachers are another.

I am not blaming teachers, I am talking about higher education institutions who are not training teachers, in my view, to teach in a contemporary way in our schools and vocational education. We have to do some things about that. You are not going to get that done without putting some of your Federal money in there to stimulate it, to

get the 8 to 1 match. We are above the national average. The Federal dollar, the Federal act that you all support has done its job.

The continuing kind of thing that is going to have to happen to make a quality issue out of all of that requires State and local leadership.

Mr. GOODLING. A few more questions.

Am I to assume that Mr. Dunham and Mr. Quarles agree with the statement on page 6, particularly the section dealing with recommendations?

Mr. DUNHAM. Yes, I do.

Mr. QUARLES. Yes. I agree with the first part. The 50–50 matching leaves it up to the State to say whether I get it or not. I would like to have the ability to get that, whether the State says it or not.

Mr. GOODLING. My second question, assuming that we do change and make this an allowable expenditure of Federal funds, how long would it take you to adjust a mix and get this operation working again?

Mr. DUNHAM. To get to 50–50?

Mr. GOODLING. If we replace the percentage in relationship to your use of these funds.

Mr. QUARLES. We could live with 50–50 if we had to, in terms of matching. There are tax levied funds for local administration, if it came down to that.

Mr. GOODLING. If we shift this again, how long would it take you?

Mr. QUARLES. If you shift it to the 50–50?

Mr. GOODLING. If we shift the whole idea of Federal dollars used for local administration?

Mr. QUARLES. We are doing that now, in fact, under the old act.

Mr. GOODLING. In October, of course, these funds are not to be used with the new act. If we change that picture again and do away with it, how long would it take you to get reorganized again?

Let's say we start the program of where you are not able to use Federal dollars for local administration.

Mr. QUARLES. If that happens I am going to look for a job someplace else, because I cannot run the city without that. It is impossible. It would devastate us completely. We do now have the planning mechanism I talked about. We are organized so that we can make some decisions based upon sound data because we have researched the needs into that. We have good staff development programs. We have a link with business and industry to tell us where their needs are. We have curriculum development that is getting our curriculum to relate to the needs of business and industries, doing task analysis, et cetera, et cetera.

I am saying, if that is wiped out, I am left with a nucleus of people who will go out to the schools and work directly with the schools but cannot help me with planning and all the developmental processes I have talked about.

Mr. GOODLING. One observation to the comments you made in relationship to the teaching and counseling, and here is where I think 9 times out of 10 75 percent of the blame has to be placed. I found that, of course, the best counselors in vocational education, in many instances, are those instructors who have been in industry and business and so on, although they do not have enough time to do that.

Many counselors, of course, are academic counselors. This is why I think we made a step in the right direction last year in the conference

committee on education on trying to pin down how you use this additional Federal funding on training and retraining counselors.

One of the ideas was to get students and counselors and teachers out to business and industry, not just for observation, but a certain amount of time, so they really know something other than the academic world.

I would like to say that on the plus side we are extremely pleased with our vocational education programs in the district which I represent. It is a real community effort. I think that is why it is successful.

I have no further questions.

Mr. LEFANTE. Thank you, Mr. Goodling.

Mr. Kildee?

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

How do you distinguish—I know some areas are easy to distinguish—how do you distinguish between administrative costs and supportive service costs? We always have had that problem in Michigan.

Michigan put a certain amount in vocational ed. for example the cost of resource persons, itinerary curriculum, consultants.

How do you distinguish between the administrative costs and supportive service costs?

Mr. DUNHAM. It is sort of difficult to so distinguish, Mr. Kildee. The problem is in the definitions we have seen, as part of the interpretation of the law, administration is identified as administrative supervisor. There are a lot of people who do think we are in neither of those capacities.

Unfortunately, there is not a support service group of people that you can talk about and identify as those requiring support in Federal, State, local or whatever who are between instruction and pure administration.

If at the State level I had to identify who the administrators are, there would be three out of 35 people. The rest are not administrators; they administrate nothing.

There are some people, then, who—four or five, I suppose, to give it a little push, whom I would call administrators because they in fact deal with our fiscal accounting, evaluation, et cetera. Not instruction support people directly, but the bulk of the people in that situation are instruction support.

Mr. Quarles has a similar situation on the local level as we have in most local areas. When you speak of the issue of the supportive aid type of person who is not a teacher, not certified, to the coordinator and counseling of services, local coordinator, supervisor of vocational education who does not teach nor is a person who is a coordinator or administrator in that sense.

There is a block of people, a large block in the sense that we are trying to improve the quality of what we are doing and not as quantity oriented as we were 10 years ago. But it is very gray, and I suggest to the subcommittee that it might be very helpful to have a support services kind of configuration. Nothing is loosely identified as ancillary services—a service, not a person, necessarily.

We need such definition. We have asked for it, from whatever levels we are talking, Federal or State legislative issues. It is hard to distinguish; for the lack of that distinction, everybody who does not teach is an administrator by law. In fact, that is silly.

Mr. KILDEE. In certain States you may have modalities of services. That differs from State to State. You might have that curriculum consultant doing performance and auditing, giving advice, being sure that the quality is that the States continue in support, or help them to raise the quality.

Really, they are neither fish nor fowl—not delivering the service directly to the student, nor are they really directly administrators.

I wonder how they are counted, saying that they can be funded or not?

Mr. DUNHAM. They are counted as administrators in our State.

Mr. KILDEE. They play a very essential role in these services.

Mr. BURKETT. Under previous acts, they have been classified as ancillary service, providing ancillary service. We are faced with a new—with the fact that you are separating out administration. In this particular act, this causes some problems, if we go back to using the term ancillary services, then we recover in that basic grant.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much.

Mr. QUARLES. If I may respond, that is a real dilemma for me. I know I am an administrator. I am concerned about the program coordinator who is dealing directly with the instructional program. That is what you are saying.

I do not classify that person as an administrator. If we are not allowed to fund that kind of person under the new act, I wonder how I am going to get my programs operating, how I am going to get them implemented in the city?

Mr. LEFANTE. Thank you, Mr. Kildee.

Mr. Miller, do you have any questions?

Mr. MILLER. No questions.

Mr. LE FANTE. Mr. Murphy?

Mr. MURPHY. I have no questions.

Mr. LEFANTE. Thank you, gentlemen. If there is anything that you would like to add to your remarks, now is the time. I have no further questions.

If you would care to sum up, please go ahead.

Mr. BURKETT. We appreciate the opportunity to present our views on this matter of administration, State and local administration, and the need to improve quality of programs through supportive services by increasing or using the 20-percent supportive, raising that to what is needed in the State.

We think if the Congress sees fit to make these changes that the law is a good law and that we can improve the quality of programs, we can expand the opportunities for youth and adults in vocational education.

We appreciate this opportunity.

Mr. LEFANTE. Thank you gentlemen for coming. We appreciate your taking the time to appear before this subcommittee.

Is there anybody else in the audience who wishes to be heard this morning?

The hearing stands adjourned.

[Thereupon, at 10:15 a.m. the hearing was concluded.]

[Material submitted for inclusion in the record follows:]

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Baltimore, Md., February 23, 1977.

HON. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee and Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: Attached is a draft of my testimony before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education presented at the hearing on Thursday, February 17, 1977, for incorporation into the Record.

Please accept my sincere thanks for this opportunity to appear before your subcommittee with regard to the Bill you have introduced, H.R. 3437. This important piece of legislation (H.R. 3437) captures the essence of virtually all of the amendments necessary to make Public Law 94–482 a useful and reality document for the administration and implementation of vocational education programs throughout this country. You and your staff are to be commended for the yeoman work you have put into the creation of Public Law 94–482 and into the detailed, critical analysis you have affected in reviewing Public Law 94–482 for the required technical amendments set forth in H.R. 3437.

We particularly commend Jack Jennings and Charles Radcliffe of the staff of the subcommittee for their tireless efforts in assuring that these laws are useful, practical, and straightforward. It is safe to say that Public Law 94–482 is landmark legislation for vocational education. It requires of us the kinds of accountability and specificity that for, all too long, have been lacking in such legislation. These gentlemen and you and other members of the committee are to be congratulated for the extremely dedicated effort you have given to this movement.

I hope that the attached comments will reflect accurately the open discussion and ad lib remarks that I presented to your subcommittee in support of the amendments called for in H.R. 3437. If I may be of any further assistance to you individually or as a representative of the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education, please feel free to call on me or ask Mr. Jennings to get in contact with our office. Again, thank you for the opportunity to appear before the subcommittee. I look forward to seeing you again very soon.

Cordially,

DANIEL B. DUNHAM,
Assistant State Superintendent,
Vocational-Technical Education.

Enclosure.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DANIEL B. DUNHAM, ASSISTANT STATE SUPERINTENDENT IN VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION IN THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee—I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before the subcommittee to react to the work you have prepared, Mr. Chairman, in the form of House Resolution 3437, aimed at correcting technical issues within Public Law 94–482 and for providing for some substantive changes with regard to the use of funds for certain areas of that law.

Let me say, first of all, that I wholeheartedly concur with the previous comments of Mr. Lowell Burkett, Executive Director of the American Vocational Association. I think Mr. Burkett has hit the nail on the head in almost every case and my comments will essentially be adding the opinion and view of the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education whom I have been asked to represent at this hearing by our President, Mr. Robert Van Tries, the State Director of Vocational Education in the State of Minnesota.

State directors of vocational education wholeheartedly welcome the accountability dimensions of Public Law 94–482. We have long awaited the direct mandates of a law such as this to assure that we, in fact, are and can be accountable for the funding that is provided through federal sources to improve, expand and, where necessary, maintain comprehensive and contemporary programs of vocational-technical education throughout this country.

There are, of course, a few problems with the law as it is presently written and we welcome the changes proposed by H.R. 3437 in correcting or embellishing dimensions of Public Law 94–482 which will be extremely limiting to us unless so corrected. Perhaps the most important issue which we face is that of state level administrative costs. It was our original understanding that section 102d

of the Public Law 94–482 was intended to strengthen and increase the capacity of the States to effectively plan, evaluate, and provide information about vocational education programs. Somehow in the process of bringing these two Bills together (that is the House version and the Senate version) in the conference process, which resulted in Public Law 94–482 becoming reality, the issue of administration was added to 102d. As you know, in the past we have had the capacity to draw on the basic grant of funds for state level administrative costs. The recently completed survey and study by the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education indicates that the actual and true costs of state level administration at this time are nearly three times the total amount allowed by 102d ($25 million) for each of the five years of the intended existence of Public Law 94–482. It is clearly beyond the realm of reason to expect states to accommodate the continuing leadership and support services roles that a state agency is called upon to provide under the law by cutting back on state level leadership costs in this manner.

Therefore, the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education strongly urges that the elements of H.R. 3437 regarding the authorization of appropriations for state level administration, in fact, be changed so that we might use funds from section 102a for these purposes.

Of course, local administrative costs are equally as important to us as the state level issue. Here again, we ask that you accommodate the area that has caused the most positive change to occur in the development of vocational education programs throughout the states. That is the business of providing for local supervision, coordination, and enabling of a broad base of vocational education programs through local leadership. A minor technical amendment to the law would enable us to continue to support this outstanding effort of local administration by allowing us to spend monies through the local education agencies for local level administrative costs. It is clear that another amendment within the bounds of H.R. 3437 is needed to include this as part of the instructional provisions of 102a and we urge you to make such an amendment.

Another issue which I feel must be addressed in the amendments listed under H.R. 3437 is the matter of the 20 percent provision for program improvement and supportive services. It is our view that this ought not to be treated as a maximum splitting of the funds (that is an 80–20 split of the total amount of funds available to a state), but as a minimum of 20 percent for program improvement and support services. Most of us welcome the 20 percent set aside earmarked for vocational guidance services. However, for some states which have been spending considerably more than that amount for that particular function, the limit of 20 percent, by virtue of the split (80–20) will seriously curtail activities which have already been established and are now ongoing for vocational guidance services in vocational education.

Likewise, other functions allowed under the 20 percent side are going to be extremely limited if the 20 percent is treated as a maximum. The 20 percent issue will be a major one for the State of Maryland and for most other states because it seriously limits our capacity to respond to the most important issues addressed under subpart 3, particularly curriculum development and personnel development. As I'm sure you are aware, we must have the capacity to provide leadership and direct support services through the improvement capacities which are an integral part of competency-based individualized curriculum development and related teacher education and inservice and preservice programs.

I am most concerned also with a technical amendment that is provided in H.R. 3437 which would "clarify that the state research coordinating units shall be responsible for innovation and curriculum contracts." I do not believe that this is the intent of the law which is permissive regarding establishment of a research coordinating unit. It is unfortunate that the effect of this amendment would, in fact, mandate administrative structuring to the state, and this is something that, as you know, Mr. Chairman, we were able to have eliminated from the Senate version of the Bill with regard to the Commission for State Planning. Now we are faced with the problem of having a sub-unit administratively mandated into our operational systems which may or may not be the best way of handling the research, exemplary (innovative), and curriculum issues. It is my judgment and view that, in many cases, research coordinating units will have had limited experience and capacity for dealing effectively with curriculum development activities. I think it is a mistake to include this change in the law and would urge to rescind the amendment proposed in sections 17 and 18 in H.R. 3437 and let the law speak to this issue.

One final point, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, that I would like to make relates to the amendments regarding consumer and homemaking administration. I believe you will find it virtually impossible to fund the administrative provisions for consumer and homemaking programs in the state from 102a money should the amendment regarding state administration be approved. Consumer and homemaking education, in fact, is not vocational education, it is "consumer and homemaking education," and we have historically, and feel we must continue, to treat it as such. Therefore, the consumer and homemaking portion (102c) should remain as it is in Public Law 94–482 and not be changed in order to take administrative money for these purposes from 102a. We would very much prefer that the administrative costs be taken from 102c for the functions of consumer and homemaking at the state administrative and support services level and urge you to remove that provision from the amendments in H.R. 3437 and revert to the provisions of 102c in Public Law 94–482.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, these are the extent of the comments that I would make before the subcommittee at this time. We sincerely appreciate the opportunity to appear before the subcommittee and provide these comments which we hope have been clarifying with regard to our position on the issues that are included in H.R. 3437. I recognize that you are most interested today in the state and local administrative issues, but I feel constrained to raise the other issues with you at this time and ask that they be entered into the Record.

Again, thank you for your kind attention. I'm ready for any questions you might have.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND GRANT COLLEGES, AND NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

The National Education Association, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, and the National School Boards Association appreciate the opportunity to comment on H.R. 3437, which makes technical amendments to the vocational education law enacted during the 94th Congress. Certain of the proposed amendments cause us major concern.

The groups named above were most active in securing passage of PL 94–482. Its enactment was greeted with enthusiasm because it incorporated many improvements in the planning process for vocational education programs. We were pleased that the practitioners, those actually operating the programs on a day-to-day basis, were to be involved in the determination of what would best meet their own and their students' needs. In addition, we view as major steps in the right direction the provision for development of new programs to overcome sex stereotyping in vocational education and the increased access to vocational training and retraining.

We are concerned that in H.R. 3437 an attempt is being made to place the money for State administrative costs in Subpart 2, Section 120(b)(1), which is the basic State grant provision. Studies have indicated an alarming increase in the percentage of Federal vocational education funds that are being used by State agencies for purely administrative purposes. If provision is made to mix funds for administration in with the basic State grant funds, these State agencies will have even more latitude in using moneys for administrative costs instead of actual program costs. We feel that the Federal money must be used at the program level where it directly impacts a large number of people in actual training provided. We will strongly oppose any amendment which would further bloat the State administrative bureaucracy at the expense of program operation.

We believe that one of the best features of the 1976 amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 was the effort by the Congress to limit abuses of administrators in taking program funds from the classroom and spending them for building bureaucracies at the State level. This abuse was greatly criticized in 1975 and 1976, and the limitations enacted by Congress were meritorious.

Those limitations had two features:

(1) Funds for State administration are to be appropriated annually as a separate line item, subject to a $25 million ceiling.

(2) Federal funds for administration are to be matched with State funds.

We believe that both of the features are important, representing well reasoned concepts in public administration. Any attempt to eliminate or substantively alter either feature should be opposed.

With respect to State administration, the new law permits the Congress to decide each year on the amount of Federal funds to be used for supporting State agency bureaucracies and affords a means for determining how much is being spent for that purpose from both Federal and State sources. Under the old law and under the proposition embodied in H.R. 3437, Congress has no effective control over the amount to be spent on State administration nor a mechanism to find out what the money is spent for.

In addition, the matching feature is certainly consistent with the theory behind a matching program such as vocational education. In some States, the whole State administrative structure is largely federally funded, while local educational programs must survive on local funds and those Federal and State funds which can be secured from the State bureaucracy. Federal funds for administration should be matched by State funds at least on a 50–50 basis. The extent to which the new law permits Federal funds to exceed 60 percent of the cost of administration is more than generous—if not a windfall.

Although we oppose increasing funds for administrative costs, we do wish to insure full implementation of the planning component that was so carefully built into Public Law 94–482. We suggest that the authorization for section 102(d) be increased to provide for the added responsibilities for planning, collection of data, annual program plans, and accountability reports. This increased funding can be phased in as follows:

$35 million for fiscal year 1978; $38 million for fiscal year 1979; $41 million for fiscal year 1980; and $50 million for fiscal year 1981.

These phased-in figures would not be incompatible with the provisions of section III(2)(B) which we favor. The appropriation of the figures recommended above would allow the States to implement their programs.

Public Law 94–482 specifically prohibited use of Federal funds for local administration of vocational education programs. This prohibition was deliberate, and was based partly on data which indicates that the amounts granted by State agencies for administration vary from as little as zero percent in 11 States to as much as 18 percent in other States. Thus there would be no standard by which to allocate Federal dollars. We oppose any move to include local administrative costs in section 102(A).

We will be watching with great interest as the Committee considers H.R. 3437, and will be happy to assist the Committee to assure full and prompt implementation of Public Law 94–482.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 22, 1977.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee,
Room 2181, RHOB.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PERKINS: I am enclosing copies of letters I have received from constituents concerning the formula for federal funding of guidance programs in Title II of the Education Amendments of 1976.

I would appreciate receiving the benefit of your views concerning the suggestion they make.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. WHALEN, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Enclosures.

THE DAYTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Dayton, Ohio, February 18, 1977.

Congressman CHARLES W. WHALEN, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHALEN: This morning's mail brought the alarming news that the formula for federal funding of guidance and counseling in Title II of the Education Amendments of 1976 (Public Law 94–482) will severely penalize Ohio. From nearly $2,000,000 this year, next year only about $380,000 would be

available. During this current year over $90,000 will flow directly to the Dayton Public Schools with additional thousands coming indirectly to us through service and workshops.

To avoid this loss to Ohio students, it is recommended that Section 103(e) which states as follows:

"From the sums allotted to a State under this section from appropriations made under Section 102(a), 80 per centum of such sums shall be available to each State for the purpose of carrying out subpart 2 of this part and 20 per centum shall be available for the purpose of carrying out subpart 3 of this part."

be amended to the following:

"From the sums allotted to a State under this section from apropriations made under Section 102(a), a maximum of 80 per centum of such sums shall be available to each State for the purpose of carrying out subpart 2 of this part and a minimum of 20 per centum shall be available for the purpose of carrying out subpart 3 of this part."

In addition, Section 110(b)(1) and (c) should be amended by adding after the word "under" in the second line of each of these references, the words, "the 80 percent maximum established for program operations in." Unless this amendment is made, the 10 percent setasides for handicapped, 20 percent setasides for disadvantaged and 15 percent setasides for adult apply to the whole amount authorized and appropriated under 102(a).

I hope we in education can count on your support in making these changes Students in Ohio need you.

Sincerely,

KENNETH RHOADS,
Coordinator, Counseling Services Division.

DR. DAVID QUICK, PUPIL PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT, MONTGOMERY COUNTY JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOL, CLAYTON, OHIO

C.W.W. please comment: Under the Educational Opportunities Act of 1976, Section 103 E states in order for a State to qualify for guidance and counseling funds, a state must meet the 20% maximum factor in sub part 3. This means that the State of Ohio will not get 70 to 75% of the funding. If the wording could be changed to 20% minimum then most states would be eligible for most of the monies available. Check into the feasibility of this change. C.W.W. report findings.

FEBRUARY 18, 1977.

Congressman CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.,
Dayton, Ohio

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHALEN: I am quite concerned over the deleterious effects that might result unless some changes are made in section 103 of the recent vocational education legislation.

In my work as a professional educator and counselor, I often see the great public education benefits that derive from the products of our vocational education system in Ohio and the legislation which supports it.

I understand that under new vocational legislation there will be cutbacks for guidance and counseling services in the state of Ohio amounting up to 70 to 75%. As currently written, 20% of these monies authorized for each state for vocational education are set aside as the *maximum* that can be expended for these services. This would ultimately mean that the amount of money generated by this would be approximately 25 percent of what is currently spent on guidance and counseling services in the Vocational Schools in Ohio.

Because of current budgetting expenditures, two areas most drastically affected by the new legislation are curriculum and anti-sex bias programs. I believe that the quantity and quality of the Vocational Education efforts in Ohio is related directly to the quantity and quality of the supportive service provided to the local school districts.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that section 103(e) which states as follows: "From the sums allotted to a State under this section from appropriations made under section 102(a), 80 percentum of such sums shall be available to each State for the purpose of carrying out subpart 2 of this part and 20 percentum shall be available for the purpose of carrying out subpart 3 of this part."

be amended to the following:

"From the sums allotted to a State under this section from appropriations made under section 102(a), a maximum of 80 percentum of such sums shall be available to each State for the purpose of carrying out subpart 2 of this part and a minimum of 20 percentum shall be available for the purpose of carrying out subpart 3 of this part."

In addition, section 110 (b) (1) and (c) should be amended by adding after the word "under" in the second line of each of these references, the words "the 80 percent maximum established for program operation in." Unless this amendment is made, the 10 percent setasides for handicapped, 20 percent setasides for disadvantaged and 15 percent setasides for adult apply to the whole amount authorized and appropriated under 102(a).

I would appreciate hearing from you on this matter, and hope that you can be instrumental in bringing about a review of this legislation now pending during the current Congress.

Sincerely,

ALAN R. BEACH.

FEBRUARY 18, 1977.

Congressman CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.,
Dayton, Ohio

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHALEN: It has recently been brought to my attention that, as currently written, section 103(e) of the Educational Amendments Act of 1976 states that from the sums allotted to a state under this section from aproriations made under section 102(a), a *maximum* of 20 percent of those monies can be expended for support services. In Ohio, a 20-percent maximum factor regarding subpart 3 would be exceedingly damaging to many of the service areas encompassed in this subpart. For example, the amount of money specified for guidance and counseling services would be approximately 25 percent of what is currently being spent.

I do not believe that Ohio should be penalized, simply because our state is already further ahead of most states in terms of progress in these areas. This is most definitely true as far as guidance and counseling services are concerned. For many other states, this legislation will mandate an increase in vocational guidance services. However, for the state of Ohio, there would be a considerable reduction in these services.

Consequently, it is my belief that there is a need for a change in the legislation. I would like to recommend very strongly that section 103(e) of The Educational Amendments Act of 1976 be amended to read as follows:

"From the sums allotted to a State under this section from appropriations made under section 102(a), a maximum of 80 percentum of such sums shall be available to each State for the purpose of carrying out subpart 2 of this part and a *minimum* of 20 percentum shall be available for the purpose of carrying out subpart 3 of this part."

Thank you very much for your kind consideration regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

GARY R. DENLINGER.

FEBRUARY 18, 1977.

Congressman CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.,
Dayton, Ohio

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHALEN: As a vocational guidance counselor I am extremely concerned about the wording and interpretation of section 103(e) of the Educational Amendments Act of 1976.

As worded, this section specifies that only 20 percent of basic grant 102(a) be made available for the program improvement and supportive services of guidance and counseling, research, exemplary and innovative programs, sex bias elimination in vocational education, curriculum development and pre-service and in-service teacher education.

Ohio currently exceeds this percentage, and the 20 percent restriction needs to be changed to permit Ohio and States like it to exceed this percentage factor in subpart 3 to maintain and improve program areas within this domain.

Sincerely,

PRISCILLA HAAG.

THE DAYTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Dayton, Ohio January 18, 1977.

Hon. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHALEN: There are four areas in the recently passed Education Amendments of 1976, title II, Vocational Education, that we feel adversely affect the growth and development of vocational education. We wish to endorse the following recommendations for corrective action:

Item I: Local Supervision and Leadership for Vocational Education.—In the present bill there is no provision for fiscal assistance for local supervision and administration of vocational education as there has been in the past. We feel that this was not the intent of Congress.

Presently, these federal dollars support 23 percent of our leadership costs (vocational director, supervisors, etc.), approximately $108,000.

Therefore, we recommend that funding for local leadership be included in title II in section 120(b)(1) as a new "N," worded "local direction and supervision of vocational education programs."

Item II: Matching for Handicapped and Disadvantaged.—We are presently required to provide for 15 percent of the cost of handicapped and disadvantaged projects funded in our district. Under the new legislation we will be required to fund 50 percent of these same projects. This would mean that in order to continue our valuable programs in this category, our local budget would have to be increased over 300 percent to approximately $307,507 for a net increase of $215,255 over our present budget.

Therefore, we recommend the following corrective action:

In Section 110(a) change the 50 percentum to 80 percentum.

In Section 110(b) change the 50 percentum to 80 percentum.

In Section 111(a)(1)(B) change the 50 percentum to 80 percentum.

The loss in federal dollars to Dayton from Items I and II would exceed $323,000, a tremendous blow in light of impending fiscal crisis.

Item III: Program Improvement and Supportive Services.—The new legislation will reduce the dollars spent in Ohio for the areas listed under section 102(a) subpart 3 of title II (research, exemplary and innovative programs, etc.) since the legislation specifically states that 20 percent of the funds allocated under section 102(a) be used to carry out subpart 3 of that part.

Ohio has spent considerably more for these areas than what is projected if we are limited to the 20 percent figure. To limit the activities in these areas by reducing the percentage of funds allowable would be very inappropriate. Reduced activities in these areas would be even more disastrous coupled with previously identified elimination of funding for local supervision and increased planning and accountability requirements.

Therefore, we recommend that the following corrective action be taken: Change Section 103(e) to read "a maximum of 80 percent of such funds" and "a minimum of 20 percent, etc."

Item IV: State Administration.—Ohio has the finest state vocational leadership team in the nation. If Ohio is to continue this leadership and if other states are to follow suit, adequate federal support is needed. The new legislation does not provide it.

Therefore, we recommend the following corrective action:

That section 102(a) be changed to allow expenditure of funds for state administration from the 80 percent of the authorizations under that section for program operation. Specifically, we recommend the addition to section 120(b)(1) a new (0): State administration and supervision.

We appreciate your past support of vocational education and hope that you can provide assistance with our recommended actions for the benefit of vocational education in Dayton, in Ohio and in the nation.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. MAXWELL,
Superintendent of Schools.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1977.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, Rayburn House Office Building.

DEAR CHAIRMAN: I have enclosed several letters from educators from the State of Ohio regarding the shortcomings in the Vocational Education Act Amendments, especially in the area of guidance and counseling. Your comments relative to their proposals for corrective legislation would be sincerely appreciated.

With best personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

DELBERT L. LATTA,
Member of Congress.

Enclosures.

NORTHWEST TECHNICAL COLLEGE,
Archbold, Ohio, February 21, 1977.

HON. DELBERT LATTA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DEL: A great deal of work has gone into the formation and finalization of the new vocational education legislation. It was our hope that this legislation would recognize and provide even greater support for vocational guidance, counseling and testing services. Initially, this appeared to be so; however, it no longer appears to be the case. On the basis of information that has been received by us, the new law would force a reduction of almost $4,000,000 in the existing four programs reported under Section 102 of the law without any funds available for curriculum or anti-sex bias efforts. For many other states, this legislation will mandate an increase in vocational guidance services.

We would appreciate your consideration on the following points:

Recommendation—It is recommended that Section 103(e) which states as follows: "From the sums allotted to a State under this section from appropriations made under section 102(a), 80 percentum of such sums shall be available to each State for the purpose of carrying out subpart 2 of this part and 20 percentum shall be available for the purpose of carrying out subpart 3 of this part."

be amended to the following:

"From the sums allotted to a State under this section from appropriations made under section 102(a), a maximum of 80 percentum of such sums shall be available to each State for the purpose of carrying out subpart 2 of this part and a minimum of 20 percentum shall be available for the purpose of carrying out subpart 3 of this part."

In addition, section 110 (b)(1) and (c) should be amended by adding after the word "under" in the second line of each of these references, the words "the 80 percent maximum established for program operation in." Unless this amendment is made, the 10 percent setasides for handicapped, 20 percent setasides for disadvantaged and 15 percent setasides for adult apply to the whole amount authorized and appropriated under 102(a).

May I suggest, if further clarification is needed, please contact Dr. Byrl Shoemaker, Director of the Division of Vocational Education or Mr. Raymond Wasil, Director of Guidance and Testing, Ohio Department of Education in Columbus.

Your consideration in looking into this legislative change would be of great service to Northwest Technical College. We appreciate the support you have given in the past and hope this will help you in understanding our problem.

Sincerely,

MAX F. COVERT,
President.

PENTA COUNTY VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS,
Perrysburg, Ohio, December 22, 1976.

Hon. DELBERT L. LATTA,
Bowling Green, Ohio

DEAR MR. LATTA: I hesitate to interrupt your holiday vacation period with matters of legislative concern; however, we have a significant problem facing us which I would like to share with you.

I participated in a HEW hearing in Columbus a few weeks ago at which time we had the opportunity to speak to provisions of the Educational Amendments of 1976. There are many good things in the bill and the Congress is to be commended for those improvements. However, the House Senate Conference Committee in some fashion juggled the language so that the final bill has some problems which I would like to share with you.

I have requested Dr. Byrl Shoemaker to summarize the impact of the problem areas and especially of issues 2 and 4 which are changes from previous legislation which will have a direct impact on funding at Penta County Vocational School. I am including the summary as provided by Dr. Shoemaker and am making myself available to discuss more directly with you the impact of the proposed procedures for implementation, as well as the apparent "oversights" in the legislation as passed. I would welcome the opportunity to visit with you if your schedule allows. I would be available on December 27 or 28 or any time on January 3, 1977 or thereafter.

As you know, our enrollment at Penta County continues to grow as we serve the 16 school districts, almost all of which are in your congressional district and it has only been possible because of good management practices locally, as well as the assistance provided via Federal and State funding. Any disruption in the latter resources can only have a crippling effect on our capacity to deliver vocational education to the over 1,600 secondary students and over 2,000 adult people participating in the programs at Penta.

Again, I would welcome an opportunity to visit with you personally, or would be glad to discuss it with you by telephone.

If your office would care to call, I could be reached at 666-1120, Penta County Vocational School, Perrysburg, Ohio.

Sincerely,

LEONARD D. KINGSLEY, Ed. D.,
Superintendent.

REPORT ON SECTIONS OF THE EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1976—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—THAT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN OHIO

By Byrl R. Shoemaker, Director of Vocational Education, State Department of Education

ISSUE 1—STATE ADMINISTRATION

The first fiscal problem in the bill relates to the funding for state administration. Information provided me indicates that funding for state administration must come from a section identified as 102(d). Within this section there is a maximum authorization of $25 million per year over the life of the bill to cover not only state administration, but also the areas of planning, evaluation, and data needs. Considering administration alone, our expenditures for administration this year, not including any expenditure for planning and evaluation, totalled approximately $1,900,000.00, leaving out administrative expenditures for home economics and guidance. The maximum amount of funds for Ohio under a $25 million appropriation would be approximately $1,125,000.00. On this basis of full appropriation under 102(d) Ohio would receive enough funds to provide for only 59 percent of the administrative costs for '78, and on the basis of only salary increases for '79, in the neighborhood of 55 percent for administrative costs. Under this projection, no funds have been projected for the purposes of planning, evaluation and data needs. The vocational education bill, however, indicates an authorization for 80 percent of the administrative costs for '78 and 60 percent of the administrative costs for '79.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the language in section 102(a) be changed to permit the expenditure of funds for state administration from the 80 percent of the authorizations under that section for program operation. This change is recommended as the best solution to a problem. This change would require the addition to section 120(b)(1) a new (0), worded as follows: "State administration and supervision."

A less desirable solution would be to increase the authorizations under section 102(d) in order to provide sufficient authorizations to cover the commitment of both the federal share of administration and the planning, evaluation and data processes. The processes of appropriation could in any year fund only 102(a) and nothing or little for 102(d).

ISSUE 2—LOCAL DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION

A second fiscal problem in the present bill is the funding of *local leadership* FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION WITHIN THE LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES. There are no provisions in the present interpretation of the bill for fiscal assistance from federal funds for local leadership. A number of states, including Ohio, have state appropriations for program operation which have not required the investment of federal funds in the direct operation of vocational education programs at the secondary level. This left the federal funds, therefore, for supportive services such as local leadership for vocational education.

The initial vocational education legislation which passed the House, H.R. 12835, included within the bill authorization for the funding of local supervision along with the authorization for state administration and supervision. The bill which initially cleared the Senate, S. 2657, included authorization for local leadership in the definition of vocational education which included not only the area of instruction, but also services to support such instruction.

The final law passing Congress, 94–482, however, did not include local supervision and administration as an authorized expenditure. States approach the issue of funding of programs on different basis. In some states funding for local leadership is included within state and federal funds allocated for the operation of the programs. In the state of Ohio funding for local leadership is not included in the state allocation of state funds for program operation, and therefore needs to be provided from the federal funds. Again, the new bill places added responsibility on the local education leadership for the preparation of a much more detailed local application than has been required before, and, in addition many more responsibilities in the areas of planning, evaluation and reporting than before. Without the maintenance of local leadership for vocational education, there will not be sufficient personnel to carry out these functions.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that funding of local leadership for vocational education (direction, supervision, administration), be included in Section 120(b)(1) as a new (N), worded as follows: "local direction and supervision of vocational education programs."

ISSUE 3—PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

A third area of fiscal concern is in the area of the funding of *program improvement and supportive services*. The law as written indicates that 20 percent of the funds under the basic allocation in Section 102(a) is to be spent for the areas of (1) research, (2) exemplary and innovative programs, (3) curriculum development, (4) guidance and counseling, (5) preservice and inservice education, and (6) grants to overcome sex bias. Using this year's appropriation and expenditure figures as a base, 20 percent of the basic funds for Ohio would be approximately $1,900,000.00. Expenditures during this fiscal year for guidance, teacher education, research coordinating unit and innovative programs total $5,812,000.00. The language of the law indicates that 20 percent of the funds for program improvement and supportive services must be spent for guidance. This amount in Ohio would total approximately $380,000.00 under the proposed allocation. During this year, however, we have budgeted an expenditure of $1,960,996.00 for the area of guidance. The expenditures for this year as reported above do not include

80-308 O - 77 - 4

any planned expenditures for curriculum or anti-sex bias efforts. On the basis of the information reported above, the new law would force a reduction of almost $4 million in the existing four programs reported under that section of the law, without any funds available for curriculum or anti-sex bias programmatic efforts. Again, it is believed that the quantity and quality of the vocational education efforts in Ohio is related directly to the quantity and quality of the supportive services provided to the local districts.

RECOMMEDATION

It is recommended that Section 103(e) which states as follows:

"From the sums allotted to a State under this section from appropriations made under section 102(a), 80 per centum of such sums shall be available to each State for the purpose of carrying out subpart 2 of this part and 20 percentum shall be available for the purpose of carrying out subpart 3 of this part."

be amended to the following:

"From the sums allotted to a State under this section from appropriations made under section 102(a), a maximum of 80 percentum of such sums shall be available to each State for the purpose of carrying out subpart 2 of this part and a minimum of 20 per centum shall be available for the purpose of carrying out subpart 3 of this part."

In addition, section 110 (b)(1) and (c) should be amended by adding after the word "under" in the second line of each of these references, the words "the 80 percent maximum established for program operation in." Unless this amendment is made, the 10 percent setasides for handicapped, 20 percent setasides for disadvantaged and 15 percent setasides for adult apply to the whole amount authorized and appropriated under 102 (a).

ISSUE 4—MATCHING OF THE SETASIDE FOR DISADVANTAGED AND HANDICAPPED

Another fiscal problem within the bill deals with the necessity to provide for 50–50 matching of the setaside for disadvantaged and handicapped by each category rather than as an overall part of 102(a). The matching of postsecondary and adult programs is of little problem, I believe, in any of the states. Within our state, however, we have treated the handicapped and disadvantaged funds in the manner that they were planned and individual projects have been established with local educational agencies to serve issues or problems not touched by the expenditures of other state vocational education funds. Local educational agencies are hardly able to maintain the present program operation, much less put 50 percent of the funding into special projects to be of assitance to supportive services for disadvantaged and handicapped. In addition, under the present language of the law, no funds can be used for the assistance with local leadership or administration and such expenditures in the local community could not, therefore, be used even for matching. In our state fiscal assistance for special projects and programs dealing with disadvantaged and handicapped have varied from 75 to 85 percent, depending upon the ability of the area to pay and the number of disadvantaged persons or handicapped persons within the local district served.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the following changes in legislation be considered in order to improve the opportunity for districts with a heavily depressed area to participate in funding under the di advantaged and handicapped setasides:

In Section 110 (a) change the 50 percentum to 80 percentum.

In Section 110 (b) change the 50 percentum to 80 percentum.

In Section 111(a)(1)(B) change the 50 percentum to 80 percentum.

FOUR COUNTY VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL,
Archbold, Ohio, February 10, 1977.

HON. DELBERT LATTA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LATTA: We as educators in the State of Ohio are very grateful for your past support of education and bills supporting education for the State of Ohio.

As of this time there are two concerns we have, both in the areas of guidance and counseling, to which we hope you will lend your support.

Public Law 94–482 has to do with the 20-percent setaside which is part of the Vocational Education Act. We are requesting that the wording be changed so that it would read more than 20 percent of these monies available to the State of Ohio may be used for support services.

Secondly, we encourage your active support of the $3,000,000 appropriation for state leadership activities in the area of guidance and counseling.

Again we would like to thank you for the support you have given education over the years and know that we can count on your continued support and leadership in the future.

Respectfully,

Larry Sinclair, Paul J. Weaner, Ray Tearney, J. Hestebernan, Gary Miller, William Knoll, Margaret M. Mailer, Dean Willman, Carole Wolfe, Dallas Corvett, Robert J. Durbin.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1977.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CARL: Enclosed is a copy of a letter from Eugene Lehrmann, State Director of the Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education. Gene, on behalf of the Board, has made some suggestions for technical amendments to Public Law 94–482 regarding funds for state and local administration.

I understand you will be holding hearings on H.R. 3437 tomorrow. I hope Gene's suggestions will be helpful as the committee considers this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
Member of Congress.

Enclosure.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
BOARD OF VOCATIONAL, TECHNICAL & ADULT EDUCATION,
Madison, Wis., February 9, 1977.

Hon. WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STEIGER: As you know, in the closing days of the 94th session, Public Law 94–482, the Education Amendments of 1976 was passed into law.

Title II of Public Law 94–482, among other things, sets forth new and expanded responsibilities for State and local agencies administering vocational education. This act mandates development of extremely detailed comprehensive plans, evaluation and data systems which place high demands on staff time and are very costly to produce. The amount of money authorized by Congress under section 102(d) for preparing the 5-year plan and the annual program plan and accountability reports, for conducting evaluations, and for State administration, is grossly insufficient to cover even present State administration let alone support the other mandates.

As a result, the Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education at a regular meeting on January 25, 1977, directed me to petition our Wisconsin Congressional delegation to take immediate corrective action to resolve this situation.

Members of the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education are extremely concerned about the future of vocational education throughout the country and strongly urge that immediate action be taken to correct the problems of inadequate funding for State and local administration.

STATE ADMINISTRATION

The preferred remedy would be for Congress to amend the Act by removing state administration as an eligible expenditure under the authorization provided

in section 102(c)(4) and placing it as an eligible expenditure under the authorization provided in section 102(a) as it had been under the previous law. The 102(d)(4) authorization would then be used exclusively for the three mandates of planning, evaluation and data collecting and reporting which is more in accord with the historical development of this legislation.

The second remedy is to increase the authorization under 102(d) to $97,000,000 to cover the necessary cost of administering this very complex piece of legislation through the year 1982.

The first remedy is preferred because it is felt that Congress already has placed sufficient safeguards on the use of Federal moneys for State administration by requiring the States to match that purpose dollar for dollar. The addition of an absolute ceiling imposes an unnecessary constraint, inconsistent with the philosophy of the 50 percent matching.

Local Administration and Supervision.—Public Law 94-482 must also be amended to allow Federal moneys to be used for local supervision and administration. It is suggested that section 120(N), Local Supervision and Administration be created to allow Federal funds to be made available for local supervision and administration.

Your assistance in urging Messrs. Perkins and Pell, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, and Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education respectively, to provide leadership in obtaining the necessary amendments immediately will contribute significantly to the improvement of vocational education not only in Wisconsin but in every State.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, your office may contact me at (608) 266-1770 or John Kroll of our staff at (608) 266-0025.

Sincerely,

EUGENE LEHRMANN,
State Director.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1977.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PERKINS: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I received recently from one of my constituents, Mr. Robert Thomas, who is involved professionally in the field of education.

Mr. Thomas has studied the Education Amendments Act of 1976, and has called to my attention a problem in this law which he discusses in the enclosed letter.

Please give Mr. Thomas' letter your attention, and furnish me with any comments or reactions you have to the suggestions Mr. Thomas has made.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES J. CARNEY,
Member of Congress.

Enclosure.

BOARDMAN LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Youngstown, Ohio, February 23, 1977.

Representative CHARLES J. CARNEY,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CARNEY: The Educational Amendments Act of 1976 includes two sections that I am especially concerned about. As a citizen of the State of Ohio and a concerned educator, I thought you would want me to call them to your attention. Specifically my concerns are related to title II of the Educational Amendments Act of 1976 on program improvements and support services. I would recommend that you seriously consider changing section 103e which states:

"from the sums allotted to a state under this section from appropriations made under section 102a, 80 percent of such sums shall be available to each state for the purpose of carrying out subpart 2 of this part and 20 percent shall be available for the purpose of carrying out subpart 3 of this part."

My suggestion would be that this be amended to read as follows:

"from the sums allotted to a state under this section from appropriations made under section 102a, a maximum of 80 percent of such funds shall be available to

each state for the purpose of carrying out subpart 2 of this part and a minimum of 20 percent shall be available for the purpose of carrying out subpart 3 of this part."

In Ohio, and in states like Ohio, we will be hurt not helped in the area of program improvement and supportive services by the provision of the Educational Amendments Act of 1976. The intent of the Act is just the opposite. However, we would be penalized simply because we are already further ahead of most states in these areas. The Act should allow us to establish 20 percent as a minimum but certainly not as a maximum allowable appropriation in this area.

In addition, section 110b(1) and c should also be amended by adding after the word "under" in the second line of each of these references, the words "the 80 percent maximum established from program operation in." Unless this amendment is made, the 10 percent set aside for handicapped, 20 percent set aside for disadvantaged and 15 percent set aside for adult apply to the whole amount authorized and appropriated under 102a.

I trust you will give consideration to my two recommended changes in the Educational Amendments Act of 1976.

Sincerely,

ROBERT THOMAS, *Director,*
Career Development.

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
EDUCATION CENTER,
Cincinnati, Ohio, February 17, 1977.

Re Public Law 94-482.

CARL PERKINS,
Representative, State of Kentucky,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: I am writing you as both friend and neighbor. I am very concerned at the wording changes made by your committee in vocational education funding legislation. In Ohio we stand to lose a major portion of our state funding for vocational guidance due to the rewording of this legislation. Ohio has been a leader in vocational education, and I would certainly expect no new monies. On the other hand, I would expect that the degree of local determination on how we spend the money we do have be kept at its present level. The changes we have suggested will in no way hinder or deprive other more needy states.

I beg you to examine the enclosed materials and reconsider the minor wording changes which damage us so greatly.

Sincerely,

THOMAS L. HUNTER, *Associate,*
Guidance Services.

ISSUE 3—PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

A third area of fiscal concern is in the area of the funding of program improvement and supportive services. The law as written indicates that 20 percent of the funds under the basic allocation in section 102(a) is to be spent for the areas of (1) research, (2) exemplary and innovative programs, (3) curriculum development, (4) guidance and counseling, (5) preservice and inservice education, and (6) grants to overcome sex bias. Using this year's appropriation and expenditure figures as a base, 20 percent of the basic funds for Ohio would be approximately $1,900,000. Expenditures during this fiscal year for guidance, teacher education, research coordinating unit and innovative programs total $5,812,000. The language of the law indicates that 20 percent of the funds for program improvement and supportive services must be spent for guidance. This amount in Ohio would total approximately $380,000 under the proposed allocation. During this year, however, we have budgeted an expenditure of $1,960,996 for the area of guidance. The expenditures for this year as reported above do not include any planned expenditures for curriculum or anti-sex bias efforts. On the basis of the information reported above, the new law would force a reduction of almost $4 million in the existing four programs reported under that section of the law, without any funds available for curriculum or anti-sex bias programmatic efforts. Again, it is believed that the quantity and quality of the vocational education efforts in Ohio is related directly to the quantity and quality of the supportive services provided to the local districts.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that section 103(e) which states as follows:

"From the sums allotted to a State under this section from appropriations made under section 102(a), 80 per centum of such sums shall be available to each State for the purpose of carrying out subpart 2 of this part and 20 percentum shall be available for the purpose of carrying out subpart 3 of this part."

be amended to the following:

"From the sums allotted to a State under this section from appropriations made under section 102(a), a maximum of 80 percentum of such sums shall be available to each State for the purpose of carrying out subpart 2 of this part and a minimum of 20 percentum shall be available for the purpose of carrying out subpart 3 of this part."

In addition, section 110 (b)(1) and (c) shall be amended by adding after the word "under" in the second line of each of these references, the words "the 80 percent maximum established for program operation in." Unless this amendment is made, the 10 percent setasides for handicapped, 20 percent setasides for disadvantaged and 15 percent setasides for adult apply to the whole amount authorized and appropriated under 102(a).

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1977.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education Subcommittee, Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: I have recently received several letters and telephone calls from constituents regarding Public Law 94-482, the Education Amendment of 1976.

Enclosed herewith please find copies of some of those letters to give you an idea of the concerns of my constituents. Certain sections of the law regarding vocational education were focused on, in particular, sections 102(a), 102(d) and 103(e).

I would appreciate your taking their views into consideration and would like to have your staff's comments on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. VANIK,
Member of Congress.

Enclosures.

OHIO VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION,
Worthington, Ohio, February 3, 1977.

Hon. CHARLES VANIK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VANIK: We want to officially thank you for your strong efforts during the past year to obtain sound vocational education legislation for the coming years. Basically we feel pleased with this act except for a few corrections which we feel are needed if vocational education is to continue to grow and improve.

The membership of our Association is greatly concerned over four specific sections of the Vocational Education Act of 1976 as it affects Ohio. The enclosed materials identify these four elements which affect all states to some degree, however, we should like to call your special attention to our third concern, "Program Improvement and Support Services," which is critical to Ohio but which we understand may only adversely affect four or five of the advanced states at this time.

This element of vocational education has much to do with its quality and as such we urge you to support action to make corrections in this legislation as proposed in the attached report to prevent harm to our Ohio program.

Vocational education is an investment in human resources and we believe that our concerns with this new vocational legislation are based on the desire to protect this national investment.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. REESE,
Executive Director.

Enclosures.

REPORT ON SECTIONS OF THE EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1976—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—THAT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN OHIO

ISSUE 1—STATE ADMINISTRATION

The first fiscal problem in the bill relates to the funding for state administration. Information provided me indicates that funding for state administration must come from a section identified as 102(d). Within this section there is a maximum authorization of $25 million per year over the life of the bill to cover not only state administration, but also the areas of planning, evaluation, and data needs. Considering administration alone, our expenditures for administration this year, not including any expenditure for planning and evaluation totalled approximately $1,000,000, leaving out administrative expenditures for home economics and guidance. The maximum amount of funds for Ohio under a $25 million appropriation would be approximately $1,125,000. On this basis of full appropriation under 102(d) Ohio would receive enough funds to provide for only 59 percent of the administrative costs for 1978, and on the basis of only salary increases for 1979, in the neighborhood of 55 percent for administrative costs. Under this projection, no funds have been projected for the purposes of planning, evaluation and data needs. The vocational education bill, however, indicates an authorization for 80 percent of the administrative costs for 1978 and 60 percent of the administrative costs for 1979.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the language in section 102(a) be changed to permit the expenditure of funds for state administration from the 80 percent of the authorizations under that section for program operation. This change is recommended as the best solution to a problem. This change would require the addition to Section 120(b)(1) a new (0), worded as follows: "State administration and supervision."

A less desirable solution would be to increase the authorizations under Section 102(d) in order to provide sufficient authorization to cover the commitment of both the federal share of administration and the planning, evaluation and data processes. The processes of appropriation could in any year fund only 102(a) and nothing or little for 102(d).

ISSUE 2—LOCAL DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION

A second fiscal problem in the present bill is the funding of local leadership for vocational education within the local education agencies. There are no provisions in the present interpretation of the bill for fiscal assistance from Federal funds for local leadership. A number of States, including Ohio, have State appropriations for program operation which have not required the investment of Federal funds in the direct operation of vocational education programs at the secondary level. This left the Federal funds, therefore, for supportive services such as local leadership for vocational education.

The initial vocational education legislation which passed the House, H.R. 12835, included within the bill authorization for the funding of local supervision along with authorization for State administration and supervision. The bill which initially cleared the Senate, S. 2657, included authorization for local leadership in the definition of vocational education which included not only the area of instruction, but also services to support such instruction.

The final law passing Congress, 94–482, however, did not include local supervision and administration as an authorized expenditure. States approach the issue of funding of programs on different bases. In some States funding for local leadership is included within State and Federal funds allocated for the operation of the programs. In the State of Ohio funding for local leadership is not included in the State allocation of State funds for program operation, and therefore needs to be provided from the Federal funds. Again, the new bill places added responsibility on the local education leadership for the preparation of a much more detailed local application than has been required before, and, in addition many more responsibilities in the areas of planning, evaluation and reporting than before. Without the maintenance of local leadership for vocational education, there will not be sufficient personnel to carry out these functions.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that funding of local leadership for vocational education (direction, supervision, administration) be included in Section 120(b)(1) as a new (N), worded as follows: "local direction and supervision of vocational education programs."

ISSUE 3—PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

A third area of fiscal concern is in the area of the funding of program improvement and supportive services. The law as written indicates that 20 percent of the funds under the basic allocation in Section 102(a) is to be spent for the areas of (1) research, (2) exemplary and innovative programs, (3) curriculum development, (4) guidance and counseling, (5) preservice and inservice education, and (6) grants to overcome sex bias. Using this year's appropriation and expenditure figures as a base, 20 percent of the basic funds for Ohio would be approximately $1,900,000. Expenditures during this fiscal year for guidance, teacher education, research coordinating unit and innovative programs total $5,182,000. The language of the law indicates that 20 percent of the funds for program improvement and supportive services must be spent for guidance. This amount in Ohio would total approximately $380,000 under the proposed allocation. During this year, however, we have budgeted an expenditure of $1,960,996 for the area of guidance. The expenditures for this year as reported above do not include any planned expenditures for curriculum or anti-sex bias efforts. On the basis of the information reported above, the new law would force a reduction of almost $4 million in the existing four programs reported under that section of the law, without any funds available for curriculum or anti-sex bias programmatic efforts. Again, it is believed that the quantity and quality of the vocational education efforts in Ohio is related directly to the quantity and quality of the supportive services provided to the local districts.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Section 103(e) which states as follows:

"From the sums allotted to a State under this section from appropriations made under section 102(a), 80 per centum of such sums shall be available to each State for the purpose of carrying out subpart 2 of this part and 20 per centum shall be available for the purpose of carrying out subpart 3 of this part."

be amended to the following:

"From the sums allotted to a State under this section from appropriations made under section 102(a), a maximum of 80 per centum of such sums shall be available to each State for the purpose of carrying out subpart 2 of this part and a minimum of 20 per centum shall be available for the purpose of carrying out subpart 3 of this part."

In addition, Section 110(b)(1) and (c) should be amended by adding after the word "under" in the second line of each of these references, the words "the 80 percent maximum established for program operation in." Unless this amendment is made, the 10 percent setasides for handicapped, 20 percent setasides for disadvantaged and 15 percent setasides for adult apply to the whole amount authorized and appropriated under 102(a).

ISSUE 4—MATCHING OF THE SETASIDES FOR DISADVANTAGED AND HANDICAPPED

Another fiscal problem within the bill deals with the necessity to provide for 50-50 matching of the setaside for disadvantaged and handicapped by each category rather than as an overall part of 102(a). The matching of postsecondary and adult programs is of little problem, I believe, in any of the states. Within our state, however, we have treated the handicapped and disadvantaged funds in the manner that they were planned and individual projects have been established with local educational agencies to serve issues or problems not touched by the expenditures of other state vocational education funds. Local educational agencies are hardly able to maintain the present program operation, much less put 50 percent of the funding into special projects to be of assistance to supportive services for disadvantaged and handicapped. In addition, under the present language of the law, no funds can be used for the assistance with local leadership or administration and such expenditures in the local community could not, therefore, be used even for matching. In our state fiscal assistance for special projects and pro-

grams dealing with disadvantaged and handicapped have varied from 75 to 85 percent, depending upon the ability of the area to pay and the number of disadvantaged persons or handicapped persons within the local district served.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the following changes in legislation be considered in order to improve the opportunity for districts with a heavily depressed area to participate in funding under the disadvantaged and handicapped setasides:

In Section 110(a) change the 50 per centum to 85 per centum.

In Section 110(b) change the 50 per centum to 80 per centum.

In Section 111(a)(1)(B) change the 50 per centum to 80 per centum.

LOS ANGELES CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 15, 1977.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member, House Education and Labor Committee, Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: As you may be aware, the Los Angeles Unified School District has achieved a reputation for providing a top-quality vocational education program to secondary and adult students. To maintain the standards of our programs, we are seeking to amend the Education Amendments of 1976 in regard to the Vocational Education Act. As presently stated in section 195 of part C of the amendments, the definition for vocational education omits the use of funds for local administrative and supervisory costs. Realistically, the ability to conduct quality vocational programs at the local level rests on the act providing for the administrative and supervisory aspects of programs. Furthermore, the major thrust of the amended act focuses on the planning and evaluation of vocational programs, which are administrative and supervisory functions.

We, therefore, are recommending that the definitions, as stated in section 195 of part C, be expanded to include provisions for the administration and supervision of vocational programs. Such a change would permit Vocational Education Act funds allocated under section 102(a) to be used for local administration.

We do not support the liberalizing of restrictions on State level administrative expenditures and are of the opinion that State educational agencies should be limited to the present total funding of $25 million. Vocational Act funds should be targeted to local educational agencies as presently mandated in the amended act. It is at the local level that students are served.

In closing, we bring to your attentoin the fact that our school district matches Federal funds for vocational education on a 10 to 1 basis. In seeking the local administrative cost, we are not attempting to supplant our local efforts but merely to enhance the ongoing program to which we are already committed. Your assistance in correcting this oversight in the Amendments will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. LUCAS.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1977.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Elementary and Secondary and Vocational Subcommittee, House Education and Labor Committee, Rayburn HOB.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have attached a letter I recently received from Ms. Elinor Sutton, a constituent of mine regarding section 102a of the Education Amendments of 1976.

Any assistance one of your staff people could give me in formulating a reply for Ms. Sutton would be greatly appreciated.

Thanking you in advance, I remain

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM STANTON,
Member of Congress.

Enclosure.

ASHTABULA COUNTY JOINT VOCATIONAL SCHOOL,
Jefferson, Ohio, February 17, 1977.

MR. WILLIAM J. STANTON,
Painesville, Ohio.

DEAR MR. STANTON: I am a vocational counselor at the Ashtabula County Joint Vocational School who is concerned with recent legislative interpretation. The Educational Amendments Act of 1976 has a section (102a) which has been interpreted to limit dispersment of funds to a 20 percent maximum on the portion designated for counselors. Such restriction could cause loss of funds in Ohio vocational counseling. Ohio is a leader in the Nation in vocational schooling and vocational counseling. Let's keep our fine leadership! Reducing our services (to a national mean?) would be a step backward. Please encourage an amendment to read that a minimum of 20 percent should be available in section 102a, subpart 2, to further vocational guidance and counseling.

I should also like to encourage the appropriation of $3,000,000 for state leadership activities in guidance.

Sincerely,

ELINOR SUTTON,
Guidance Counselor.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Trenton, N.J., February 22, 1977.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: Public Law 94-482, the Education Amendments of 1976, was passed after much debate and healthy state involvement. In the area of Vocational Education, much was accomplished that could be lost because of what I believe to be an unfortunate oversite in the authorization of appropriations.

Title I, subpart 1 (general provision) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended to read:

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 102(d)—There are also authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1978 and for each fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1982 for the purpose of assisting States in:

1. Preparing the 5-year plans required under section 107;
2. Preparing the annual program plans and accountability reports, including the collection of necessary data, required to be submitted under section 108;
3. Conducting the evaluations required by section 112;
4. State administration of Vocational Education programs assisted under this act.

I am sure you are aware that, for the purposes of this act, the term "administration: means the activities of the State necessary for the proper and efficient performance of its duties under this act, including supervision, but not including ancillary services". (Part C—Definition, section 195 (20).) The States will find it impossible to properly administer the law without an increase in authorized dollars.

For example, in the State of New Jersey, should the $25,000,000 remain as it is currently authorized and New Jersey's allocation formula remain unchanged, our maximum allocation for the four requirements of section 102(d) would total approximately $750,000. Currently, this would result in a shortfall in New Jersey of approximately $1,000,000 for administration, planning, evaluation, and dissemination. It is my firm belief that such was not the intent of the Conference Committee.

I propose that the law be amended to retain planning, evaluation, and dissemination in 102(d) (1, 2, and 3) at the $25,000 authorization. Item 4 in 102(d) should be moved to 102(a) to allow administrative costs to be paid out of the basic grant area—Section 102(a). Obviously, the authorized appropriation for 102(a) should be raised by an amount sufficient to continue fair and reasonable administrative costs in the States. My best estimate on the basis of information supplied to me is that the amount needed reaches approximately $80,000,000.

This alternation would place this issue to rest once and for all by providing an amount more realistic in terms of responsibilities as required in the legislation. After all of the work and long months of struggle to produce a genuinely good product such as this bill, it would be unfortunate to have its implementation threatened by this matter.

Sincerely,

FRED G. BURKE,
Commissioner.

JEFFERSON COUNTY JOINT VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL,
Bloomingdale, Ohio, March 1, 1977.

Congressman CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: Over a period of many, many years your efforts have made an outstanding contribution to the growth and development of vocational education in our Nation. Your efforts on the national scene have helped bring to fruition in Ohio what we strongly feel is a statewide vocational system that has had and will have a tremendous impact on the youth of our State. At the present time, well over one-third of all our high school juniors and seniors are enrolled in full time job training programs. You should feel pride as a result of your legislative accomplishments.

To a large extent the goal of making a substantial quantity of vocational education available has been accomplished in our State. Now, our very clear and necessary next goal is that of elevating and maintaining the quality of our vocational offerings. You have always sought excellence in education and I am certain that you share a desire to attack that second but essential goal of quality. A key to the attainment of the goal of quality resides in outstanding local supervision, counseling, and administration. The funds needed to provide quality in these areas of responsibility are relatively small when one considers the vast expenditures for buildings, equipment and instruction. Without outstanding supervision, counseling, and administration in the local school, all those other invested dollars diminish significantly in effectiveness. You just can't put buildings, equipment, books, students, and teachers together and have something automatically happen. It takes excellent supervision, guidance counseling, and administration to see that the ingredients jell into a productive process.

On October 1, 1977, the necessary support of Federal dollars for local supervision, guidance counseling, and administration will be terminated under the terms of the new legislation. In our vocational school it will mean the loss of approximately $45,000 for the support of these areas that are vital to the total effectiveness of our program. I strongly urge the reconsideration of the facet of the new law that will preclude this vital support. We in Ohio have a program of excellence in which we have great pride. Your contributions to the legislation that have helped to produce the Ohio program certainly justify your sharing in this pride. We do not want to see any lessening of the quality of the Ohio program. I am certain that you share this feeling also. With deepest respect for your past efforts, I sincerely and strongly encourage reconsideration of the legislation so that this loss of support to these vital areas of our program may be restored. Your serious consideration of this request will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE HARGRAVES,
Superintendent.

CLEVELAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Cleveland, Ohio, February 16, 1977.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: This letter is being written to share my views relative to the Vocational Education Sections of Public Law 94-482. The Committee on Education and Labor is to be highly commended for having held the many hearings, reviews, and conferences on Vocational Education sections which have resulted in comprehensive legislation designed and written to meet the real needs of Vocational Education in the United States.

Due to congressional leadership, we in Cleveland are pleased to note that vocational efforts have increased tremendously over the past 12 years in the Cleveland Public Schools. Presently, 69 percent of our 11th and 12th grade students are enrolled in high quality vocational education programs. We have been able to develop new programs, modify existing ones, and close out obsolete programs, working locally with over 1,000 members of various technical advisory committees. To remain sensitive to emerging trends relative to the needs of employers on the State and national scenes, we use our own independent surveys, together with job projections from the Ohio Bureau of Employment Service and the Ohio Department of Education.

As a result of continually monitoring and up-dating vocational education, we presently have 457 vocational teachers and a range of 66 vocational program areas. An additional 578 teachers teach prevocational and adult vocational programs.

As the vocational education opportunities for youth have increased, we have noticed a greater proportion of disadvantaged and handicapped pupils electing to participate in vocational education programs. To provide for disadvantaged and handicapped pupils, supportive services are required, such as staff, materials, equipment, inservice and preservice programs, transportation, work orientation, and greater evaluation efforts.

In reviewing the vocational education sections of the Education Amendments of 1976, we are puzzled that the "set asides" for the disadvantaged and the handicapped cannot be used for anything except instruction supplies, and equipment. However, funds continue to be needed for rental of facilities, maintenance of facilities, and other costs of local leadership in planning, curriculum development, and evaluation.

The vocational education sections of the Education Amendments of 1976 which concern the Cleveland Public Schools are funded in the following amounts during the fiscal year 1977:

Local supervision and administration	$113,598.31
Support services (guidance)	11,000.00
Innovative programs	115,710.00
Teacher education	59,435.46
Disadvantaged funds: 16.54 percent of the State projects are in Cleveland	461,417.05
Handicapped funds: 20.77 percent of the projects of the State are in Cleveland	456,184.00
Total	1,217,344.82

Funding of leadership for vocational education within the local education agency is critically needed to implement, operate, and evaluate vocational education programs as prescribed by Congress.

By setting a limit of 20 percent of the funds under the basic allocation in section 102(a), expenditures in Cleveland will fall far below the levels now being utilized and will result in a drastic cutback in exemplary and innovative programs, curriculum development, guidance and counseling, preservice and inservice education, research, and programs designed to overcome sex bias in Vocational Education programs.

The 50-50 percent provision for the matching of the "set asides" for disadvantaged and handicapped, instead of the 15-80 percent we now enjoy, will present a great hardship on urban areas.

To cut the funds needed by large urban areas which have the greatest concentration of the economically distressed youth would limit the progress of the past 12 years in obtaining jobs and self-fulfillment of urban youth.

I urge your serious consideration and adoption of the definition of vocational education as proposed in S-2657 so that local administration can be one of the purposes for which section 102(a) funds can be used to present concerns of a large urban school system.

Thank you for your kind attention to my remarks.

Very truly yours,

PAUL W. BRIGGS,
Superintendent.

EDUCATION CENTER,
Lakewood Center, Wash., February 18, 1977.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: As vocational educators at the local level, we very much appreciate your help in designing and fostering appropriate Federal vocational legislation, and have been reading with interest your progress of conducting hearings relating to the authorizations and possible technical changes in the new law. (Public Law 94–482.) Having been in vocational education for 27 years, the past 15 years as a local vocational administrator, there is one important factor that I sincerely believe outweighs most all of the others, at this point in time.

In all my many vocational activities, I have been impressed by the fact that it takes a certain type of person at the local level, on the firing line, to stand up for vocational education, to promote it, to become involved in the rules, regulations, legislation, financing, etc. That person is quite often an unpopular "change-agent," who must survive in an academic world, under many adverse pressures, not usually understood by outsiders. The primary factor that seemed to be most important over the years, has been that under Federal statute that person's salary could qualify for 50 percent support from Federal funds. When other pressures seemed to dictate that the local school districts would like to diminish vocational emphasis, it was finally the financial advantage which tipped the scales in favor of keeping vocational programs under a motivated vocational leader.

Most vocational State plans, which include regulations for vocational certification, were also based around the concept that certification and financing went together. If vocational personnel were properly qualified and certificated, funds would follow. Now, if the financing of vocational supervisors on the local level disappears under the new law, there is absolutely no reason for vocational certification to be required. This means that local vocational directors could be replaced by academic personnel, those who have been left over from other district assignments, a condition which usually occurs when the "crunch" is on a local school district during levy losses, and reduced enrollment in many of the high schools.

To restate the problem, without Federal financial support, the local vocational administrator's job is in jeopardy, and the "missionaries" who have done so much for vocational education in the past, well begin to disappear in our secondary school systems.

I hope you understand the seriousness of this situation, and it is regrettable that the information was not properly channeled or understood in the design of the original legislation. Thanks for your dedication to vocational education, Mr. Perkins, and what you have done in the past will go down in the history of vocational education as a vital part of the movement that began to put the emphasis on accountability in our public schools.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR M. SNYDER,
Administrator for Vocational Education,
Director of Clover Park Voc-Tech. Institute.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Concord, N.H., January 31, 1977.

Mr. JOHN F. JENNINGS,
Counsel, Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JENNINGS: In December, Commissioner of Education, Dr. Robert L. Brunelle wrote to you regarding the New Hampshire Department of Education concerns relative to the recently passed Public Law 94–482, the Education Amendments of 1976, as they relate specifically to State administration.

As a followup to the Commissioner's correspondence, I wrote to you on December 23, expressing concern about congressional appropriation allocations in the bill to support administration of Vocational-Technical Education at the secondary and post-secondary levels. It was pointed out that, if the $25 million is distributed equally to all States, New Hampshire would receive $500,000. This year, at the State and local levels in New Hampshire, $695,591 is being spent for administration and supervision.

Educators throughout the country have written to the American Vocational Association, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, and to their congressional delegations indicating the need to enact technical amendments and/or substitute amendments before the new act takes effect on October 1, 1977.

Enclosed is a bulletin dated January 5, 1977, issued by the American Vocational Association regarding legislative information. The bulletin outlines amendments needed to correct the deficiencies in Public Law 94–482.

We are in full support of the alternative recommendations made by the American Vocational Association. Although we would lean toward alternative 1 under State administration as a condition of the law as it presently exists, we would yield to whatever recommendation appears to be politically expedient.

Your interest in and support for technical amendment change at an early date will be most appreciated.

Cordially yours,

CHARLES H. GREEN, *Chief,*
Division of Post-Secondary Education.

NEW HAMPSHIRE VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL COLLEGE,
Portsmouth, N.H., February 7, 1977.

Mr. JOHN F. JENNINGS, *Counsel,*
Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JENNINGS: The following is written relative to the recently passed Public Law 94–482, the Education Amendments of 1976 with particular reference to the State Administration impact that will occur in New Hampshire if the present format or appropriations limitations are maintained in the Act.

Your support for either of the American Vocational Association's alternative proposals, see enclosure, is urged to correct the above problem. I prefer the alternative which would adequately increase the administrative appropriation under the existing Act's format.

The State of New Hampshire appropriates in excess of five and one-half million dollars a year of which four million is from State general fund revenues for postsecondary vocational-technical education in the State. This compares with a projected $250,000 to $300,000 of Federal Basic Grant Postsecondary funds made available from Public Law 94–482. The ratio of State general fund to Federal grants for postsecondary vocational-technical education is therefore between 13 and 16 to 1 with the ratio of the total public postsecondary vocational-technical education budget to Federal Voc-Ed funds approaching 25 to 1.

In spite of this approximately 13 to 1 ratio the Federal funds do provide very significant and positive assistance. About one-half of the Federal funds have provided all of the State level Administrative support in the past. The $150,000 or so of Federal funds that have been used for State level administration *and* service functions would appear to be modest in terms of the total operation and in terms of meeting Federal reporting requirements.

The new legislation is written in such a way that, without revision, this already minimum State level operation utilizing Federal Postsecondary funds would be reduced to a level making it difficult or impossible just to meet all Federal reporting requirements.

Your attention to supporting either of the two American Vocational Association's suggested alternatives will be appreciated. My personal preference is for an increase in the appropriation authorization and ultimately a full appropriation under the administrative section of the act as written.

In addition, a clear definition of administrative functions to place consulting and similar functions under other than administrative categories would be helpful.

Your consideration of this will be appreciated.

Cordially yours,

DR. GEORGE M. STROUT,
Acting Director.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 24, 1977.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
Rayburn Building.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Francis Tuttle, the Oklahoma State Director for Vocational and Technical Education, has sent me the enclosed correspondence concerning pending legislation.

I would greatly appreciate any comments which you may have on this matter so that I may properly respond to Dr. Tuttle. Your thoughtfulness in assisting me in this matter is greatly appreciated.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

TOM STEED,
Member of Congress.

Enclosure.

OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT
OF VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION,
Stillwater, Okla., January 19, 1977.

Hon. TOM STEED,
U.S. Representative, Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEED: We are grateful for the efforts you made on behalf of legislation for vocational education during the last session of the Congress. As a result of the actions of the Congress, we have a piece of legislation which has some interesting possibilities.

Although we are generally pleased with the legislation, there are some aspects that create some rather serious problems. One of the major areas of difficulty is in the area of State and local administration. The new legislation at the present time calls for such costs to be taken from Section 102(d) which is a separate category of funding to deal with the five-year plan, the annual plan, and accountability report including data collection and evaluation. Even if 102(d) were appropriated at the level authorized ($25,000,000), it is doubtful that all of the expenses for the above categories could be funded without considering State and local administration.

It is our understanding that members of the Education and Labor Committee are aware of this problem and are taking steps to recommend a change to rectify this problem. They are considering two possible approaches—one would be to change the definition of vocational education to include State and local administration under the uses for which 102(a) funds could be used under Subpart 2, Section 102(b)(1). Either of these approaches would provide the necessary flexibility for us to continue to give direction to vocational and technical education in Oklahoma.

We shall attempt to keep you informed on this matter and will appreciate your support of this very important proposed change.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS TUTTLE, *State Director,*
Vocational and Technical Education.

U.S. CATHOLIC CONFERENCE,
OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT LIAISON,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1977.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Education and Labor Committee, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to call your attention to what appears to be a technical error in Section 111 of Title I of the Vocational Education Act as revised by Title II of the "Education Amendments of 1976," (Public Law 94-482).

Section 111 (a)(1)(C) reads as follows:

"(C) 100 per centum of the cost of vocational education programs described in Section 122(f), 133(b) and 140."

The reference to subsection "133 (b)" should read "132 (b)". The intent of this provision is to provide 100 percent Federal funding for those programs which in-

clude a requirement for nonpublic school participation. Section 133 does not have such a requirement whereas Sec. 132 does provide for nonpublic school participation.

In addition, it should be pointed out that the reference to the specific subsections: "122(f) and 133(b)" (or 132(b) if corrected) is ambiguous. Both the House and Senate versions of this legislation provided for discretionary 100 percent funding for the programs authorized by both sections without specifying the subsections dealing with nonpublic school participation. The Conference compromise changes the discretionary funding to mandatory funding for both and specifies that this 100 percent Federal funding is only for those subsections which refer to the nonpublic school provisions. These changes create confusing statutory language leaving the intent unclear. It would seem that Section 111(a)(1)(C) should provide for discretionary 100 percent funding for programs authorized by Sections 122 and 132.

We would recommend that these changes be incorporated in your bill making technical amendments to the "Education Amendments of 1976."

Sincerely,

JAMES L. ROBINSON,
Director.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1977.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Elementary and Secondary Education, Committee on Education and Labor

DEAR CARL: I recently received the enclosed letter from Mr. Elwood A. Padham, Associate Commissioner of the Maine Department of Educational and Cultural Services concerning the new Educational Amendments of 1976, Public Law 94–482.

I would greatly appreciate your consideration of this letter. Any information that you could provide me as to what action can be taken would be very helpful.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM S. COHEN,
Member of Congress.

Enclosure.

STATE OF MAINE,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL SERVICES,
Augusta, Maine, February 3, 1977.

Hon. WILLIAM S. COHEN,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: The State of Maine Department of Educational and Cultural Services, Bureau of Vocational Education, needs your help. We are in trouble with the new Education Amendments of 1976, Public Law 94–482.

To start with, the Federal law states that Federal funds for fiscal year 1977–78 will be no less than the State received in fiscal year 1975–76, which was $3,214,373. This is approximately $300,000 less than we received in 1976–77. The way this legislation is written, we have lost the flexibility of using Federal funds to help the citizens in the State of Maine when we have to match every category on a fifty-fifty basis.

The first fiscal problem that the State of Maine has with this law relates to the funding of State administration. The funds for State administration will come from Section 102d of the Act, and it is my understanding that within this Section there is a maximum authorization of 25 million dollars per year over the life of the bill to cover not only State administration but also the areas of planning, evaluation, and data needs.

Considering administration alone, our expenditures for administration this year, not including any expenditures for planning, data collection and evaluation, totalled nearly $500,000, which included personal services, travel, rental of office space, supplies, utilities, etc.; and it is my understanding, after discussing this with the Regional Office in Boston, that the State of Maine will be receiving approximately $96,431 for Section 102d, and this would mean that we would be cutting our staff in half. I cannot comprehend how we can continue to live up to the requirements of this law if we don't have people in this office to help with these tasks.

We are very proud of the vocational education system in Maine. We were evaluated by the U.S. Office of Education this last summer through a Management Evaluation Review, and the findings were that the State of Maine is operating an outstanding program in vocational education for the citizens of the State, fiscally sound and in compliance with the public law at that time (90–576).

The suggestion I have at this time is to increase the 25 million dollar authorization to 100 million dollars so the State may have the funds to do what is required by the law in administering vocational education programs, or change the legislation to permit the expenditures for State administration from 102a funds rather than 102d funds. If we don't have increased appropriations to this new legislation, we would have trouble having enough funds to cover the administration of vocational education.

I know you are well aware of the efforts the State and local people in Maine have made to make vocational education services available to our citizens. The State has spent close to 70 million dollars over the past 10 years, of State and local monies, to house these programs. The State and local efforts in providing operating costs for these programs is $6 of local and State monies to every $1 of Federal monies that flows into the State.

This law has placed rigid responsibilities on the State Department of Educational and Cultural Services in terms of planning, coordination, evaluation, reporting, and data collection as well as the leadership role for vocational education in the State. It is hoped that additional funding will be made available so that we may have the people to do the work that is required by this law.

Another fiscal problem within the bill deals with the necessity to provide for 50–50 matching for the setasides for disadvantaged/handicapped by each category rather than an overall part of 102a. We should have across-the-board matching if we are going to deliver the services that are needed in these two areas in Maine. In Maine we have treated the handicapped and disadvantaged funds in a manner that planned and individualize projects have been established with local educational agencies to serve the issues or problems not touched by the expenditures of other state vocational education funds. Local educational agencies are hardly able to maintain their present program operation, much less than 50% of the funding into special projects to be of assistance to support services for the disadvantaged and handicapped.

It is recommended that changes in the law should be proposed that will permit the expenditures of up to 100% of the funds for the disadvantaged and handicapped programs within the local community in which students were provided services or programs not part of a regular vocational education program of that local education unit.

Again, I would like to emphasize that this is a serious problem for the State of Maine in dealing with this new law, and I am asking for help from you to see if changes can be made in the law and additional funding be made to the State of Maine.

I also want to thank you for all the help you have given this office in the past.

Sincerely,

ELWOOD A. PADHAM,
Associate Commissioner.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1977.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman,*
Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn House Office Building.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed are copies of letters I have received from Mr. Stuart M. Bundy, President of Henry Ford Community College and Mr. Arthur J. Elges, Dean of Henry Ford Community College. I would appreciate it if these could be made part of the record of the hearing on the vocational education provisions of the Education Amendments of 1976 scheduled for February 17.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely,

WILLIAM D. FORD,
Member of Congress.

Enclosures.

HENRY FORD COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Dearborn, Mich., January 26, 1977.

Hon. WILLIAM D. FORD,
U.S. Representative,
Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FORD: We are concerned with the omission of "administration" from the definition of "vocational education" in Section 195 (1) and the prohibition of funds available for administration in Subpart 2, Basic Grant, Section 120, of the Education Amendments of 1976, Public Law 94–482, Title I Vocational Education.

This college has one of the oldest and largest career education programs in Michigan. A large part of this success since 1938, and especially in recent years, has been the administrative leadership. We feel this kind of leadership would be seriously impaired—and the programs would suffer—if some amendments are not made.

I hope you will study this matter carefully and consider supporting an amendment to include funding of local administration as originally written into House Resolution 12835 and Senate Resolution 2657. Your support could have a far-reaching impact on the wide diversity of students of all ages whom we are attempting to serve.

Sincerely yours,

STUART M. BUNDY,
President.

HENRY FORD COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Dearborn, Mich., January 25, 1977.

Hon. WILLIAM D. FORD,
U.S. Representative,
Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FORD: This letter is intended to express my concern with the omission of administration from the definition of "vocational education" (sec. 195) (1) and the prohibition in the use of funds available for administration from Subpart 2, Basic Grant, Sec. 120 of the Education Amendments of 1976 Public Law 94–482 Title I Vocational Education.

It is my belief that postsecondary vocational-technical education has in large measure achieved the success it has during the past decade largely as a result of vocational-technical administrative leadership at the local, regional, and State levels.

The increased emphasis in the planning, evaluation, and accountability, and the emphasis in overcoming sex stereotyping of vocational education are laudable. These are administrative functions. The elimination of funds for the administration of vocational-technical education are dichotomous to the intent of the Act and will be detrimental to achieving the spirit and implementation of the Act.

I strongly urge your support in amending Public Law 94–482 to include funding of local administration as originally written into H.R. 12835 and S. 2657. Your support of this critical issue will have a far-reaching impact upon vocational programs and their delivery for disadvantaged, handicapped, to overcome sex stereotyping, and to others who are in need of the services that only vocational education can provide.

Cordially,

ARTHUR J. ELGES,
Dean, Technical Education.

SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Salem, Oreg., February 10, 1977.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ULLMAN: The support you gave for the passage of the 1976 Education Amendments is greatly appreciated.

The Vocational education of the Act is particularly addressed in this letter. We are committed to providing leadership, direction, and technical assistance to the secondary system, the community college system, and other related manpower training programs in our State.

After analyzing the amendments as passed by Congress, we see two major problems. First, the Act will not provide adequate Federal funds to allow us to support our existing State department operation for vocational education. Second,

the Act does not allow local education agencies enough flexibility in the use of funds from the basic grant.

In preparing our biennial budget for the current Oregon Legislature, it was our understanding that the Act would provide a 20/80 ratio (20 percent State funds, 80 percent Federal funds) for support of State administrative staff for the first year of our biennium. The second year of the biennium would require a 40/60 ratio, and the third year the ratio was to be 50/50. That provision is in the Act, but since State administration is being limited to Section 102 (d) of the Act, there is not enough money authorized in that section to allow the ratio to work.

We recommend that the purposes under 102 (d) be continued but that State administration be allowed use of basic grant funds (Subpart 2–Basic Grant, Section 120 (b) (1)). A second alternative would be to increase the dollar amount in Section 102 (d). Since this is a problem shared by most States, a national survey was completed which indicates that the following levels would be required:

Fiscal year 1978—$78 million to pay 61 percent of State administration.
Fiscal year 1979—$85 million to pay 60 percent of State administration.
Fiscal year 1980—$80 million to pay 50 percent of State administration.
Fiscal year 1981—$88 million to pay 50 percent of State administration.
Fiscal year 1982—$96 million to pay 50 percent of State administration.

On the matter of allowing local education agencies to have flexibility with funds, it is recommended that the Senate definition of vocational education be adopted, which would permit Section 102 (a) funds to be used for local administration and other support services.

This would allow the districts adequate flexibility to make the most effective use of Federal vocational funds for the expansion and improvement of vocational education at the local level. We would not anticipate this being a problem in the bill since both H.R. 12835 and S.B. 2647 contained language which permits Federal funds to be used for local administration. However, in the Senate-House conference between the two bills, the use of Federal funds for local administration was dropped.

If these two major provisions cannot be made in the 1976 Vocational Education Amendments, the current legislation could be disastrous for the continued support and improvement of vocational education in our State, and we would not be able to utilize Federal funds for their greatest impact.

However, if these two provisions can be made, we feel that the 1976 Vocational Education Amendments will be a very effective piece of legislation for the advancement of vocational education in the State.

If you have additional questions or wish to discuss any of these concerns in greater detail, please feel free to call Monty Multanen, State Director of Career and Vocational Education at (503) 378-3584.

Your support will be appreciated.

Cordially,

VERNE A. DUNCAN.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *February 15, 1977.*

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: This letter is specifically in regard to Title II—Vocational Education of the Education Amendment of 1976. I have a concern about the wording related to spending for guidance activities and services.

The language should be changed from "20 percent of the total amount shall be used for Guidance" to "not less than 20 percent of the total amount to be spent in Guidance . . ."

The need for this change is that some states (i.e. Ohio) are currently spending more than this percentage and the language is such that Ohio would be forced to spend less to comply. The intent of this Bill, however, is to encourage states to increase their expenditure for Vocational Guidance. This change in the language then, will not put a ceiling on Vocational Guidance expenditures related to this portion of the Educational Amendments.

My concern is that you not only be aware of the need for this change, but you utilize your vote and influence to accomplish it. Thank you for your support of Vocational Guidance.

Sincerely,

JAMES V. WIGTIL.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1977.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding that the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education is presently considering H.R. 3437 to amend the Vocational Education Act. There are several provisions of this Act which concern me, and I am most hopeful the Committee will consider amending these provisions during its deliberations on this legislation.

First, I am concerned over the maximum authorization allowed annually for state administration, planning, evaluation, and data needs. My own state of Ohio currently spends approximately $1.9 million for administration alone. The maximum amount provided by this Act is $1.25 million, and this will not allow Ohio adequate funds for administration. I very much hope the Committee will see fit to amend Section 120(2) of the Act to allow funds for program operation to be used for administration.

I understand that Public Law 94-482 does not provide funds for funding of local leadership for vocational education within the local education agencies. I feel it is extremely important to maintain local leadership and strongly recommend that the Committee consider amending Section 120(b)(1) to provide for Federal funding for this purpose.

A third area of concern is the funding of program improvement and supportive services. As enacted, the law provides that 20 per cent of the funds under the basic allocation in Section 102(a) is to be spent for program improvement and supportive services and that 20 per cent of these funds must be spent for guidance. Using this year's appropriation figures, this would allow Ohio only $1,900,000 for program improvement and approximately $380,000 for guidance. As Ohio currently expends $5,812,000 for guidance, teacher education, research coordinating and innovative programs and has budgeted $1,960,996 for guidance alone, this would force a reduction of approximately $4 million in these programs. If the language of the law were amended to provide that a maximum of 80 per cent of such sums shall be available to each state for the purpose of carrying out subpart 2 and a minimum of 20 per cent shall be available for carrying out subpart 3, this problem would be eased.

Another provision of the Act which will cause fiscal problems in Ohio is the necessity to provide for 50-50 matching of the setaside for the disadvantaged and handicapped by each category rather than as an overall part of 102(a). I very much hope the Committee will consider amending Sections 110(a) and (b) and 111(a)(1)(B) by changing the 50 percentum to 80 percentum as this would help Ohio and other states in similar circumstances to avoid disruptions in these programs.

I hope you will share my views with the members of your Committee and shall appreciate your giving my recommendations your careful consideration.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. HARSHA,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 22, 1977.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In light of the hearings your Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education plans on H.R. 3437 and other measures to make technical changes in the Education Amendments of 1976, I thought you might be interested in the enclosed correspondence. Mr. Herbert Mehne, the Vocational Coordinator for the New London Public Schools, has several suggestions for modifications in the present law.

I will, of course, appreciate your consideration of Mr. Mehne's comments during the hearing and mark-up processes.

With thanks and best regards,

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. CORNELL,
Member of Congress.

NEW LONDON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
New London, Wis., February 3, 1977.

Representative ROBERT J. CORNELL
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CORNELL: Having just recently attended a hearing on the Education Amendment of 1976 (Public Law 94–482), it is quite obvious that either the Congress failed to piece together the necessary elements of the House and Senate bills to meet the purpose of the act or that the interpretation of the act needs clarification. There are two areas which should be considered: (1) State Administration, (2) Local Administration. Public Law 94–482 states that it is the purpose of the vocational education title to assist states to improve planning in the use of all resources available to them for vocational education and manpower training; to extend, improve and, where necessary, maintain existing programs; to develop new programs; to overcome sex discrimination and sex stereotyping in vocational education; to provide part-time employment for youth who need the earning to continue their vocational training so that persons of all ages can have ready access to training and re-training which is of high quality.

The way the present act is stated it will be very difficult to accomplish this purpose. I recommend that the Congress consider the following alternative to the problem as technical amendments to Public Law 94–482 before the October 1 effective date.

I. STATE ADMINISTRATION

Under the provisions of the act (Section 102(d)), as currently written, state administrative costs are to be taken from a separate authorization of $25 million annually. The purpose of this section is to authorize federal funds for preparing the five year comprehensive state plan; preparing the Annual Program Plan and accountability report, including necessary data; conducting evaluations and state administration of vocational education.

Recommendation—Alternative 1

It is recommended that state administration be removed from the purposes of Section 102(d) and be placed under the uses of basic grant funds (Subpart 2—Basic Grant, Section 120(b)(1)). The rationale is that the $25 million authorization level under Section 102(d) is needed to do the five year plan, annual plan, accountability report, including data collection and evaluation. Also, funding state administration under the Basic Grants to States would permit the states to use as much as needed for state administration. It should be pointed out that the authorization level under Section 102(a) starts at $880 million for fiscal year 1978 and goes to $1.485 billion in fiscal year 1982.

Recommendation—Alternative 2

A recent study of the amount of federal funds used during fiscal year 1976 shows that the matching ratio of federal funds to state funds used in state administration is 39 percent federal to 61 percent state. The projected total amount of funds used in fiscal year 1976 was approximately $54,500 and under the mandate of the new act for comprehensive planning it is estimated that $11,000,000 additional funds will be needed—a total of approximately $65,500,000. Using a yearly inflation factor of 10 percent, it is recommended that the authorization level for Section 102(d) to carry out the purposes of (1) developing the five year plan; (2) developing the one year plan and accountability report including data collection; (3) doing the evaluation; and (4) state administration be increased to: fiscal year 1978, $78,000,000 to pay 61 percent of state administration;[1] fiscal year 1979, $85,000,000 to pay 60 percent of state administration;[2] fiscal year 1980, $80,000,000 to pay 50 percent of state administration;[3] fiscal year 1981, $88,000,000 to pay 50 percent of state administration;[3] fiscal year 1982, $96,500,000 to pay 50 percent of state administration.[3]

II. LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

Prior to the passage of the Education Amendments of 1976, one of the original documents House bill H.R. 12835 contained language which permitted use of federal funds for local administration and the corresponding Senate bill S. 2657

[1] Matching requirement for Fiscal Year 1978 is 80 percent Federal, 20 persent State.
[2] Matching requirement for Fiscal Year 1979 is 60 percent Federal, 40 percent State.
[3] Matching requirement for Fiscal Years 1980, 1981, 1982 is 50 percent Federal, 50 percent State.

contained local administration in the definition of vocational education. In the Senate-House conference between those two bills, the use of federal for local administration was dropped.

Recommendation—Alternative 1

It is recommended that the Senate definition of vocational education be adopted and that local administration be one of the purposes for which Section 102(a) funds can be used. The rationale for including local administrative costs are quite obvious since the major thrust of the new act is to improve planning and to evaluate the programs. This responsibility falls heavily on local administration. Quality programs often hinge on the leadership of the local administrators.

Recommendation—Alternative 2

In the event that the definition of vocational education is not changed to include local administration it is recommended that local administration be listed as one of the purposes for which Section 102(a) authorized funds can be used under Subpart 2, Section 120(b)(1).

Sincerely,

HERBERT H. MEHNE,
Vocational Coordinator.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1977.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Education and Labor Committee,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CARL: Attached is a letter which I have received from one of my constituents Dr. Charles J. Corrigan in which he raises a question with regard to the definition of Vocational Education in Section 195 of the Education Amendments of 1976 and it would be very helpful to me in responding to my constituent to have your comments with regard to this deletion.

Your attention to this request is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,
Member of Congress.

Enclosure.

MID-MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE,
Harrison, Mich., February 4, 1977.

ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,
Office Building,
...shington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CEDERBERG: This letter is intended to express my concern with the omission of administration from the definition of "vocational education" (Sec. 195)(1) and the prohibition in the use of funds available for administration from Subpart 2, Basic Grant, Sec. 120 of the Education Amendments of 1976, P.L. 94-482 Title I Vocational Education.

It is my belief that postsecondary vocational-technical education has in large measure achieved the success it has during the past decade largely as a result of vocational-technical administrative leadership at the local, regional, and state levels.

The increased emphasis in the planning, evaluation, and accountability, and the emphasis in overcoming sex stereotyping of vocational education are laudable. These are administrative functions. The elimination of funds for the administration of vocational-technical education is dichotomous to the intent of the Act and will be detrimental to achieving the spirit and implementation of the Act.

I strongly urge your support in amending Public Law 94-482 to include funding of local administration as originally written into H.R. 12835 and S. 2657. Your support of this critical issue will have a far-reaching impact upon vocational programs and their delivery for disadvantaged, and handicapped, to overcome sex stereotyping, and to others who are in need of the services that only vocational education can provide.

Sincerely yours,

DR. CHARLES J. CORRIGAN,
Dean of Occupational Education.

CHARLEVOIX-EMMET INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Charlevoix, Mich., February 4, 1977.

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE,
Representative in Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RUPPE: It is my understanding that Public Law 94-482 (The Education Amendments of 1976) is currently being evaluated by federal officials since it will be necessary for Congress to enact technical or substantive amendments early in the 95th Congress.

The following amendments are needed:

I. STATE ADMINISTRATION

Alternative recommendation No. 1.—It is recommended that state administration be removed from the purposes of Section 102(d) and be placed under the uses of basic grant funds (Subpart 2—Basic Grant, Section 120(b) (1)). The rationale is that the $25 million authorization level under Section 102(d) is needed to do the five year plan, annual plan, accountability report, including data collection and evaluation. Also, funding state administration under the Basic Grants to States would permit the states to use as much as needed for state administration. It should be pointed out that the authorization level under Section 102(a) starts at $880 million for fiscal year 1978 and goes to $1.485 billion in fiscal year 1982.

Alternative recommendation No. 2.—A recent study of the amount of federal funds used during fiscal year 1976 shows that the matching ratio of federal funds to state funds used in state administration is 39 percent federal to 61 percent state. The projected total amount of funds used in fiscal year 1976 was approximately $54,500,000 and under the mandate of the new act for comprehensive planning it is estimated that $11,000,000 additional funds will be needed—a total of $65,500,000. Using a yearly inflation factor of 10 percent, it is recommended that the authorization level for Section 102(d) to carry out the purposes of (1) developing the five year plan; (2) developing the one year plan and accountability report including data collection; (3) doing the evaluation; and (4) state administration be increased.

II. LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

Alternative Recommendation No. 1.—It is recommended that the Senate definition of vocational education be adopted and that local administration be one of the purposes for which Section 102(a) funds can be used. The rationale for including local administrative costs are quite obvious since the major thrust of the new act is to improve planning and to evaluate the programs. This responsibility falls heavily on local administration. Quality programs often hinge on the leadership of the local administrators.

Alternative Recommendation No. 2.—In the event that the definition of vocational education is not changed to include local administration it is recommended that local administration be listed as one of the purposes for which Section 102(a) authorized funds can be used under Subpart 2, Section 120(b)(1).

The issue is to provide financial incentives for adequate administration to do the necessary planning and evaluation of vocational education programs.

Sincerely,

SUSAN J. SHEPHERD,
Director, Vocational Education and Career Development.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 17, 1977.

HON. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you on behalf of the vocational education schools and programs throughout the State of Mississippi.

I am enclosing copies of the correspondence I have received from the Mississippi vocational education centers, and I would deeply appreciate your accepting these letters as comment on the Education Amendments of 1976, (Vocational Education) Title II, Sections 201-204, state and local support, effective October 1, 1977.

As you may know, Mississippi is a leader in the field of vocational education, both on the secondary and post-secondary levels. To hamper the operation of vocational programs, as the legislation would by not granting federal support on the local level and reducing support on the state level, would be an injustice to the young people of Mississippi and any other state striving to fulfill vocational education needs.

On behalf of the vocational education community of Mississippi, I am asking your favorable consideration of their appeal.

Thank you for your time and attention in this matter.

Sincerely,

DAVID R. BOWEN,
Member of Congress.

MONROE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Aberdeen, Miss., February 15, 1977.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR HONORABLE BOWEN: In reference to Public Law 94-482, October 12, 1976, Title II—Vocational Education Sections 201 to 204.

The act as written and as is being interpreted, has no provisions for local administration of programs and limited funds for State administration.

It is believed that this was not the intent to exclude these funds for local administration and feel like this wil be corrected.

I would greatly appreciate your full cooperation and support in getting this matter corrected.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. ROBERTS,
Vocational Coordinator.

PRENTISS COUNTY VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL,
Booneville, Miss., February 14, 1977.

Re Public Law 94-482, October 12, 1976, Educational Amendments of 1976, title II, vocational education sections 201 to 204.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The act as written and as is being interpreted has no provisions for local administration of programs and limited funds for state administration.

The vocational counselors in Mississippi have for a number of years been a vital link between the student, the parent, the school, and business and industry. Much of the success of vocational guidance programs is due to adequate local and state administrative services. For the best use of federal, state, and local funds for vocational education, it is imperative that vocational education be properly administered so that students will receive the necessary training, placement, and follow-up services after employment.

Your assistance in restoring funds for local and state administration under Public Law 94-482 will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. COX, Jr.,
Guidance Counselor.

PICAYUNE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL CENTER,
Picayune, Miss., February 11, 1977.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOWEN: In recent conferences concerning planning and development of Vocational and Technical Education, Public Law 94-482 has been read and discussed to determine conditions under which we will work for the upcoming years and also some restrictions to which we may be subjected. This causes us to become really concerned about two specific matters.

First of all is the question as to whether the law provides funds for administration on both the state and local level. We feel sure that this condition would cripple the function of the administration of vocational education on both the

state and local level. We want to go on record and request that the interpretation be made to provide for administrative functions or that amendments be made to accommodate them.

Second is the possibility of the elimination of Occupational Orientation as a result of the new definition of Vocational Education in the law. As we understand the occupational orientation class has been initiated and fostered as a functional phase of guidance.

In our school system, the Occupational Orientation classes have served well as a group guidance situation as well as individual guidance. In further support, we will say that the Occupational Orientation classes have fostered the process of many junior high school students learning for themselves in a more positive way. It has also cited them in a more positive way in learning about the world of work.

We have very positive convictions that many of our junior high school students are staying in school and becoming better prepared as productive citizens as a result of Occupational Orientation classes.

The loss of any funding for reasons recorded above would definitely curtail training and adjustments for many of our students. We hereby request your assistance in maintaining and continuing funds for our programs.

You have been most helpful in the past and we trust that through your assistance the training of our youth will continue.

Yours sincerely,

PHILIP B. HUNT,
Director, Vocational-Technical Education.

WINONA VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL CENTER,
WINONA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Winona, Miss., February 11, 1977.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOWEN: I am writing to you in reference to Vocational Bill No. 94-482, educational amendments of 1976, sections 201 to 204.

The act as written is being interpreted as no provisions for local administration. Supervision was left out in the definition of vocational education in the bill somehow.

It is extremely important that funds be provided for administration of this program at both the local and state level through either a technical amendment or allowance in the basic grant.

Please contact the committee members who wrote the bill about this urgent matter.

I will appreciate very much your efforts to have the provision reinstated.

Sincerely,

BOBBY S. TRUSSELL.

MISSISSIPPI DELTA JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Moorhead, Miss., February 11, 1977.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BOWEN: I am writing in reference to Public Law 94-482 (October 12, 1976) Education Amendments of 1976, Title II—Vocational Education, Sections 201 to 204.

The problem is that the Act is written and being interpreted as having no provisions for local administration of programs and limited funds for state administration.

I would like for you to take what steps you possibly can to see that local administration is added back into the Bill. It is my personal opinion that this was an oversight in the first place.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Yours sincerely,

W. D. GARDNER,
Assistant Director,
Vocational-Technical Center.

MOORHEAD, MISS.,
February 11, 1977.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BOWEN: I am very concerned with the Public Law 94–482 as it is presently written. There are no provisions for local administration funds and limited funds for state administration as I am sure you are aware.

I urge you to support legislation to amend Public Law 94–482 to include a provision for local and state administrative funding so that other areas of education will not suffer from lack of funds.

Your consideration in this legislation will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

BILLY W. WILLIAMS.

MISSISSIPPI DELTA JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Moorhead, Miss., February 11, 1977.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BOWEN: As I interpret Public Law 94–482, there are no provisions for funding local administrative salaries and very little provision for administrative services on the state level.

As it would seriously encumber our efforts on the local level to provide quality vocational training and absorbs the additional costs of administrative salaries, I am requesting that you wholeheartedly endorse and support legislation to amend Public Law 94–482.

Also, in light of the new requirements, specifically elimination of sex-bais and sex-stereotyping, and due to the evercharging and increasing demand for quality vocational technical education, I would encourage you to press for a full appropriation of the Bill.

Knowing that you are aware of the service that Vocational Education renders the State of Mississippi and fully content that you will do everything possible to aid in the continuance of this service, I remain

Respectfully yours,

JOE W. CARLEY,
Vocational-Technical Counselor.

MISSISSIPPI DELTA JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Moorhead, Miss., February 11, 1977.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BOWEN: I am writing in regard to Public Law 94–482 (October 12, 1976), Education Amendments of 1976, Title II, Vocational Education, Sections 201–204.

I would like for you to consider taking steps to help us reinstate provisions for local administration which were left out of the Bill as written.

With kindest regards, I remain

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES P. FOLEY, Jr.,
Director, Vocational-Technical Ed.

WEST POINT AREA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL CENTER,
West Point, Miss., February 11, 1977.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BOWEN: As an interested citizen, taxpayer, and educator of the State of Mississippi, I request your help in a matter concerning the education of the youth of Mississippi. I make reference to Public Law 94–482 which is the Education Amendment of 1976 and more specifically to Title II—Vocational Education Sections 201 to 204.

The problem is that the act as written is being interpreted as having no provisions for local administration of programs and limited funds for state administration.

If this act stands as is, it will place a hardship on the local vocational programs in the state. It will place the burden on the state and local schools which are already on the bottom economically.

I do request that you give this matter some attention, because it needs to be amended before the new school session which begins on July 1, 1977.

I also extend a welcome to you to visit our Vocational Complex in West Point.

Respectfully,

EDDIE ODOM, *Director.*

MCCORHEAD, MISS.,
February 11, 1977.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BOWEN: I am taking this oportunity to express my opinion of Public Law 94–482 Education Amendments of 1976. As you are aware, this Law (P.L. 94–482) does not include provisions for local administration and only limited funds for state administration. Without provisions for administrative funds, all phases of vocational education will suffer because funds for administration funding will have to come from other areas.

I am urging you to support amendments to Public Law 94–482 to include provisions for local funding. I also urge you to support 100% of the authorization of appropriations for this Law as stated in Section 102.

Section 134 of this Law should also be supported. At this time the State is in need of any legislation that supports pre-vocational guidance and occupation orientation. This Section (134) also deals with sex bias and sex stereotyping. Sex bias and sex stereotyping should be eliminated from vocational education and should be aided by grants as stated in Section 134.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. MCAFEE.

GOLDEN TRIANGLE VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL CENTER,
DIVISION OF EAST MISSISSIPPI JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Columbus, Miss., February 14, 1977.

Hon. DAVID L. BOWEN,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DAVID: When Public Law 94–482 was passed, just before the Senate adjourned, it left out any provisions for local or state administration of Vocational-Technical Education.

East Mississippi Junior College now has 3 people on payroll receiving 91.8 percent salary reimbursement from State and Federal funds. With our financial condition it seems impossible for us to pick up 100 percent of these three salaries. Without these salaries it would be impossible to operate the programs we have going.

It is my understanding that it is possible for the Senate to technically correct the bill. We need action on this immediately so we can plan for the future.

Any assistance you can give to correct this problem will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

AARON LANGSTON, *Director.*

THE NORTHEAST MISSISSIPPI JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Booneville, Miss., February 14, 1977.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a Mississippi Administrator in Vocational Education, I am writing to you to strongly support educational amendments to Public Law 94–482, October 12, 1976, educational amendments of 1976.

The problem is that the act as written and as is being interpreted has no provisions for local administration of programs and limited funds for state administration.

Please vote for administrative funding amendments.

Sincerely,

JIMMY H. CRANE,
Assistant Director,
Vocational-Technical Division.

PRENTISS COUNTY VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL,
Booneville, Miss., February 11, 1977.

Re Public Law 94–482, October 12, 1976, Educational Amendments of 1976, title II, vocational education sections 201 to 204.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: From the beginning of vocational education until the enactment of Public Law 94–482, federal funds have been mandated for local and state administration. The results of the absence of funds for administration would be chaotic. The federal, state, and local governments have a tremendous amount invested in facilities and equipment, and it is imperative that adequate administration be continued.

Your assitance in restoring funds to be used for local and state administration under Public Law 94–482 will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

JOHNNY W. BROWNE,
Assistant Director.

PRENTISS COUNTY VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL,
Booneville, Miss., February 11, 1977.

Re Public Law 94–482, October 12, 1976, Educational Amendments of 1976, title II, vocational education sections 201 to 204.

Congressman DAVID BOWEN (First District,)
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The act as written and as is being interpreted has no provisions for local administration of programs and limited funds for state administration.

As an instructor of metal trades, I do not wish to see my program and the other programs in our vocational complex suffer from the lack of funds for adequate administration. Without continued leadership, our youth and adults would suffer in many respects—both educationally and economically.

Your assistance in restoring funds for local and state administration under Public Law 94–482 will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

GENE GANN,
Metal Trades Instructor.

NORTH PANOLA VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL CENTER,
Como, Miss., February 11, 1977.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN (First District),
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regard to Public Law 94–482—October 12, 1976—Title II—vocational education sections 201 to 204. The act as written and as being interpreted has no provisions for local administration of programs and limited funds for state administration.

To continue existing programs in vocational education funds need to be provided to help pay for local administration. Therefore, I beg you to please support legislation and use your influence with others to help us to get PL 94–482 amended to include the necessary funds for local and state administration of vocational education.

Sincere'y yours,

MARVIN HAYES, *Local Director.*

LOWNDES COUNTY VOCATIONAL COMPLEX,
Columbus, Miss., February 11, 1977.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: This is in reference to Public Law 94–482, October 12, 1976, educational amendment of 1976, Title II, vocational education sections 201–204.

There is no clear statement anywhere in these sections that my salary is to be funded as has been in the past years. This disturbs me. Neither is there more than limited funds for the state administration.

When this comes up for review or correction I sincerely trust you will cast a favorable vote for the above named items.

Respectfully,

J. A. ASHLEY, *Director.*

PRENTISS COUNTY VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL,
Booneville, Miss., February 11, 1977.

Re Public Law 94–482, October 12, 1976, Educational Amendments of 1976, title II, vocational education sections 201 to 204.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The act as written and as is being interpreted has no provisions for local administration of programs and limited funds for state administration. As you know, Mississippi has made unbelievable growth and progress in vocational educational. With the leadership and funds from both federal and state governments, many facilities have been constructed and supplied with modern equipment and teaching aids. These facilities serve on a wide area concept, and the importance of adequate administrative services has increased accordingly.

Your assistance in restoring funds to be used for local and state administration under Public Law 94–482 will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

MERRIL T. CARTWRIGHT, *Director.*

GREENWOOD PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL CENTER,
Greenwood, Miss., February 15, 1977.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE DAVID BOWEN: I am concerned about "Public Law 94–482—October 12, 1976 Education Amendments of 1976, Title II—Vocational Education Sections 201 to 204."

The act as written and as is being interpreted has no provisions for local administration of programs and limited funds for state administration.

Sources that I have talked with have said that the omission was an oversight since these services have been provided for in all past legislation. The omission theory is also indicated by the way the bill is written.

The desired action I am asking you to take is to contact the Committee members and have them correct the legislation by a substitute or technical amendment.

It is felt that failure to have this legislation corrected will greatly effect the progress made in vocational education in the State of Mississippi.

Thank you for your support in the past and please know that we will appreciate your help in getting the amendment change.

Sincerely,

DANNY E. HARDIN,
Vocational Director.

ITAWAMBA JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Tupelo, Miss., February 15, 1977.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOWEN: I would like to thank you for all you have done in the past for our nation and our great State of Mississippi.

At this time, I would like to solicit your help in clarification or perhaps a change in Public Law 94–482—October 12, 1976 educational amendments of 1976—Title II—vocational education—sections 201 to 204.

This section, as written and as is being interpreted, has no provisions for local administration of programs and limits funds for state administration.

I sincerely encourage your help in getting something done with this section whereby funds for local administration and state administration for vocational education can be re-directed. This is very important for our continued success with the program that we now have operational.

Thank you very much, and come by and see us when you are in Tupelo.

Sincerely,

BILLY LOWRY, *Supervisor,*
Special Vocational Education Center.

FEBRUARY 11, 1977.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BOWEN: As a vocational counselor and one interested in strong, organized and productive education for all our people, I would ask you to not support Public Law 94–482.

Being familiar with this bill as I'm sure you are, you realize that in most cases a strong program takes a strong, interested, and adventurous individual to run it. This law offers only limited funds for these state administrators.

I urge you to take a special look at this bill and do what you can to strengthen its substance. Continued confidence in your ability to promote more than quality vocational training in Mississippi makes for strong personal convictions.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES SMEDLEY,
Vocational Counselor.

OXFORD LAFAYETTE BUSINESS & INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX,
Oxford, Miss., February 15, 1977.

Hon. DAVID BOWEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOWEN: I am writing in reference to Public Law 94–482, October 12, 1976, Educational Amendments of 1976, Title II, Vocational Education Sections 201–204.

The above mentioned act as written and is being interpreted has no provisions for local administration of vocational programs and limited funds for state administration of vocational programs.

As you are well aware, Mississippi is a leader in the field of vocational education, both on the secondary and post-secondary levels. To hamper the operation of such programs would be an injustice to the young people of this Great State. I respectfully encourage you to research this matter and to make an attempt to see that the proper adjustments are made to the act.

The entire act is of vital importance, particularly due to the state of our economy and the need for people to be employed. Section 134 of Title II provides funds for vocational guidance and counseling. The assistance of vocational counselors has become more and more important, and thus is another reason why the adjustment and passage of this act is a necessity to continue the vocational education programs of Mississippi.

As a representative of the State of Mississippi, you, Sir, are keenly aware of Mississippi's need to continue to progress.

I have faith that you will give this matter your prompt attention. Thank you for what you have always done for Mississippi.

Sincerely,

DALTON ANTHONY,
Vocational Guidance Counselor.

MARTHA'S VINEYARD REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Oak Bluffs, Mass., January 25, 1977.

Hon. GERRY STUDDS,
State House, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. STUDDS: I am writing concerning the Educational Amendments of 1976 (PL 94–482) which is currently being evaluated by state and federal officials. It is apparent to me as a vocational educator of twenty years experience that either Congress failed to correctly combine the necessary elements of the House and Senate bills or the interpretation of the act should be clarified.

As you are aware the purposes of PL 94–482 are to improve planning; to extend, improve, and where necessary maintain existing programs; to overcome sex bias discrimination and stereo typing in vocational education, and to provide part time employment of youth to enable their continuation in vocational training. My disagreement with the act is not based on these stated purposes but rather with specific sections which are contradictory to those stated purposes.

Following are recommendations which, I believe, would correct several contradictions which are rather obvious after cursory examination of the act.

Section 102(d) of the act provides for state administrative costs from separate authorization. The responsibility of state administration is vastly increased by the act, yet funding for this purpose is severely limited. I would recommend that funding for state administration be placed under the uses of basic grant funds (Subpart 2—Basic Grant, Section 120(b)(1)). This funding of state administration under the Basic Grants to States would provide a flexibility which would ensure that every state could and would deliver the product expected once and for all. Obviously some states would require proportionately more funds than others, but the result would be a uniform process and quality of vocational education.

It is recommended that the Senate definition of vocational education be adopted and that local administration be one of the purposes for which Section 102(a) funds can be used. Again the accomplishment of objectives hinge immediately upon the administrative leaders in the local school districts. Without adequate funding from non-local sources this leadership will be absent or diminished. In the event that the definition of vocational education is not changed to include local administration it is recommended that local administration then be specifically listed one of the purposes for which section 102(a) authorized funds can be used under Subpart 2, Section 120(b)(1).

I urge that you look into the contradictions pointed out and take appropriate action to correct PL 94–482. Your action will be important to the continued improvement of vocational education in Massachusetts and, more particularly, Martha's Vineyard. A good beginning has been made and will continue with your help.

Thank you for your patience and hopefully, for your assistance.

Sincerely,

HERBERT F. CUSTER, JR.,
Vocational Coordinator.

ACSA COMMITTEE,
Norwalk, Calif., March 4, 1977.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education Subcommittee, House Education and Labor Committee, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: I am sure you are aware of the problem that exists with local school districts as a result of the 1976 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act. I make particular reference to Section 195, part C of the amendments.

The Board of Directors of the Association of California School Administrators adopted unanimously the enclosed resolution. The Association's Statewide Committee for Federal Legislation and Finance strongly urges your support in amending Section 102(a) of the above referenced legislation in a manner that will allow local school districts to cover all the costs including administrative and supervisory that are required under the act.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. LUCAS,
Chairman, Federal Legislation and Finance Committee.

Enclosure.

Whereas, the Education Amendments of 1976 to the Vocational Education Act eliminated the use of federal funds to cover local administrative and supervisory costs required by the amended Act, now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of California School Administrators go on record in support of an amendment to Section 195, part C of the 1976 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act to permit use of funds under Section 102(a) to be used by Local Education Agencies to cover all costs, including administrative and supervisory, required under the Act.

Adopted unanimously by ACSA Board of Directors at its meeting in Norwalk, Calif., February 14, 1977.

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 2, 1977.

HON. CARL PERKINS,
Member of Congress, Kentucky, House Post Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: Title II of Public Law 94-482, "The Education Amendments of 1976," (Vocational Education) has a serious omission which requires an immediate amendment. The definition of a vocational program as described in the Act must be amended so as to provide the local school district the necessary administration and supervision to carry out a quality program.

It is my understanding that you, Congressman Perkins, have introduced H.R. 3437 on February 9, which amends Title II of the Public Law 94-482. The amendment should include provision for a local school district to spend VEA monies for administration and supervision at the District level. For your information, I am including that part of the Act that is under discussion and my suggestion for amendment.

Part C Definitions, Sec. 195 (1) now reads, "The term 'vocational education' means organized educational programs which are directly related to the preparation of individuals for paid or unpaid employment, or for additional preparation for a career requiring other than a baccalaureate or advanced degree; and, for purposes of this paragraph, the term 'organized education program' means only

"(A) instruction related to the occupation or occupations for which the students are in training or instruction necessary for students to benefit from such training, and

"(B) the acquisition, maintenance, and repair of instructional supplies, teaching aids and equipment; and the term 'vocational education' does not mean the construction, acquisition or initial equipment of buildings, or the acquisition or rental of land."

The suggested amendment is to add (C) as follows:

(C) Necessary administration, supervision, and coordination may be provided to carry out the purposes of vocational education as they relate to the organized education program in (A) and (B) above.

Some confusion exists about desirable amendments because there is also an amendment in H.R. 3437 that will allow more money spent for State Administration of VEA.

To allow more money spent at the state level and none at the local District level will not help local high school vocational programs.

May I urge you to use your respected influence in the House of Representatives to support the amendment I have suggested. Please discuss my letter with your colleagues. Without such an amendment, local school districts will be hard pressed to provide meaningful and viable vocational education programs for the students in public schools.

Respectfully,

DONALD F. REYNOLDS,
Director, Career Education Services Unit.

○